

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1956

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

S.P.G.B.

CONTENTS

No. 617 Vol. 52 January, 1956

THE FAKING OF REPORTS
BY THE BEAVERBROOK
PRESS

THE FABIANS, BERNSTEIN
AND REVISIONISM

AUSTRIAN DEMOCRACY

CAPITALISM AND LABOUR-
SAVING MACHINERY

MR. BEVAN AND THE
BOMB

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

D
4

The Rich Still Own the Country

LABOUR SPOKESMEN ADMIT OUR CHARGE

IN OUR ISSUE for August, 1955 ("Labour Party Programme for the Year 2000") we showed how the Fabian forerunners of the Labour Party recognised well over half a century ago that the basic fact about capitalism is that the means of production and distribution are owned by the small capitalist minority, and how the four Labour Governments of 1924, 1929, 1945 and 1950 had done absolutely nothing about it. The early Labour Party placed on record that ten per cent. of the population own 90 per cent. of the wealth and promised to change this situation: it was to be their alternative to the establishment of Socialism, their answer to the S.P.G.B. For a time, in the burst of Labour enthusiasm after the second world war, some of the more ignorant and some of the more impudent of their spokesmen claimed that the aim had been practically achieved. They said that the Welfare State and the Labour policy of "Fair Shares for All" had pretty nearly abolished the old extremes of riches and poverty. We said that there was absolutely no truth in this, and now two Labour Party supporters have admitted that we were right. The occasion for this belated confession is that the recent defeat at the General Election has set the Labour Party the task of finding a new programme to get them back into power, and the line they are preparing to take is a campaign for "equality of ownership."

Writing in the *Sunday Pictorial* (27/11/55) a Labour M.P., Mr. Wilfred Fienburgh, said:—

"Let us face it. There ARE two classes in Britain to-day. There is the one-tenth that owns nine-tenths of the wealth and there are the others, 45,000,000 others, who own practically no wealth at all."

Then there is Professor W. Arthur Lewis, who writes on "The Distribution of Property" in the Labour journal, *Socialist Commentary* (December, 1955). He writes:—

"Two-thirds of the private property in this country is owned by less than 4 per cent. of the population. This uneven distribution lies at the root of most of the evils with which Socialists have been concerned in the economic sphere—especially the uneven distribution of income and of economic power."

Professor Lewis goes on to say that his Party has not yet even discovered how to tackle the job.

"One of the principal tasks of a Socialist Party is to alter the distribution of property, and we have not yet begun to use any tool which can have this effect." (His italics.)

Here, of course, the S.P.G.B. takes issue with the Professor. It is not one of the principal tasks of a Socialist Party to alter the distribution of property within

the capitalist system, which is what he still aims to do, and it is not "one task" but *the* task. The aim of a Socialist Party, though not of the Labour Party, is to end private ownership—transform the means of production and distribution into the common property of the community.

Professor Lewis says that the Labour Party thought that nationalisation and death duties would make capitalist property ownership more equal. He has no difficulty in showing that they haven't had this effect. The S.P.G.B. was saying the same before the Professor was born, but though he has, at this late stage, recognised the truth of what we said, he blunders on into supposed other ways of abolishing the basis of capitalism without abolishing capitalism. His new suggestions, naturally, are just as fatuous as those he rejects.

We can, first, briefly establish our point that he is not even considering the establishment of Socialism, for although he starts by identifying himself with Socialism, he goes on to line himself up with "believers in a mixed economy" and, indeed, he concedes that his objective of "the more even distribution of private property" is one he shares "with all liberals."

He first toys with the idea of using the proceeds of death duties to make grants to those who own no property so that they can buy houses, but finds a snag in it because, he says, the thriftless ones will merely spend the money on other things or let the house fall into disrepair. It does not occur to the Professor—who, by the way, is regarded by the *Manchester Guardian* (2/12/55) as a potential saviour of the moribund Labour Party—that what the propertyless live on is their wages and, as has been shown in practice time and time again, subsidies on housing or on other necessary items of expenditure operate to discourage wage claims, leaving the workers where they were. Indeed, the Professor manages to write a lengthy article on the condition of the propertyless majority without even mentioning the fact that they are a wage-earning class, dependent for their standard of living on what they can get for the sale of

their working energies to the propertied minority.

This fact which he completely ignores makes nonsense of his other schemes for rendering the ownership of property less unequal. What he proposes is that the Government shall acquire property by a capital levy or by making a profit on its nationalised industries or by levying an additional tax on company profits, to be taken out by the Government in the form of owning company shares.

How this would benefit the propertyless working class Professor Lewis does not explain; which is not unnatural because the net effect would be nothing at all. The Government would either use this additional income to reduce taxation in other directions, which would leave things as they are, or would acquire more nationalised industries which also would leave the propertyless still propertyless. It may be that Professor Lewis is silly enough to suppose that the Government as employer would give higher wages—something contrary to all experience—but in any event he does not offer this suggestion.

Finally, if it were possible (which it is not) to make the working class into small property owners, this would simply make capitalism unworkable. With their hands thus strengthened in the wages struggle the workers would be able to press up wages to the point of destroying the employers' profits, the result of which would be widespread bankruptcy and unemployment. Even the less powerful effect of "full employment" has shown how this would operate, for it has been met by Labour and Tory Governments alike with the policy of "wage restraint," and latterly by the pleas of economists and others for more unemployment in order to keep industry working profitably by depressing wages.

Professor Lewis's "brilliant" notions are just a variation of the original Labour Party schemes and will solve no working class problem. He is another example of the truth that the Labour Party will try to do everything with capitalism except to abolish it and establish Socialism.

H.

SERMONS IN STONE

TO some people the fact that the Socialist Party has existed for 50 years is objectionable. At least, that is what they say. We suspect in many cases they would object equally strongly if it had existed one day, or even one hour. But they try to give their criticism the appearance of reason and logic by saying that the Party must be wrong because it has talked for 50 years and still very few workers are aware of the idea of Socialism.

Modern speleologists, in their delvings below ground, have discovered blind albino fish that have never seen the light because the earth's surface interposes between them and the sun.

Many workers are like these blind fish. They cannot see the light of day because they live in a mental cave.

Our critics would have us believe that the cause of these workers' darkness is the light—Socialism itself. They would deny that it is the reformist worker's abject acceptance of the orthodox and conventional, without even trying to think, which condemns him to monotony.

Because the idea of Socialism has existed many years no more makes it wrong than the idea of flight, or radium or radio. All these things existed as ideas in

peoples' heads for several years before they were actually achieved, and most of the ignorant and stupid mob went on denying their existence for years after they had been working.

In fact the original stuff of the earth from which life itself emerged; water—has existed for ever—yet there are still those whose acquaintance with it might be described as limited.

A most striking example of a commonplace object of this kind which exists in masses almost everywhere is "The Pebbles on the Beach." With this title Mr. Clarence Ellis has produced an utterly fascinating book—the result of an active hobby of collecting and studying pebbles, for many years.

And yet millions regularly loll and sprawl on the beaches during their summer holiday without the beginnings of a ghost of a notion that in the pebbles around their feet lie the secrets of the history of the earth, the formation of the rocks, the different kinds of rocks, the birth of rivers, the existence of ice ages and the reasons which go to produce a piece of jet in Yorkshire, basalt in Scotland or granite in Cornwall. Mr. Ellis points out

what an interesting pastime this can become when one starts to make a collection of suitable specimens.

Our critics of the Socialist Party's long existence, were they logical, would condemn the pebbles which have lain on the beach for millions of years and not the ignorance of those who take no intelligent interest in the world around them. The Socialist stands in relation to the

working-class as the geologist; in this case, Clarence Ellis, to the world at large.

It is the duty of those who know, to make their knowledge available in the easiest form. All that is true. But without the intelligent desire to learn the workers will get nowhere.

HORATIO.

THE FABIANS, BERNSTEIN AND REVISIONISM

NOW and again old ideas turn up and, after some refurbishing, are presented as fresh discoveries. The old wine in new bottles is then described as the sole product of the very latest and most highly developed vineyards. The working class movement has been no stranger to this fraudulent or ignorant artifice, and many a reputation has been built upon the deception.

Since the Socialist movement began most of those who claimed adherence to it have been obsessed with the idea of a mass movement. Even most of those who claimed to be Marxist have hedged, compromised, and thrown principles to the winds in order to swell the numerical support for a movement that put Socialism in the forefront as its theoretical aim, and then took practical action that denied this aim. The result has been defeat, disaster and the submerging of much that was valuable.

Examples of this craving for a mass following have been the Fabians, the Bernstein Revisionists, Independent Labour Party, the Industrial Workers, of the World, the Labour Party, the Communists and, recently, movements like the one sponsored by G. D. H. Cole. Supporters of these movements have brought up old arguments and ideas as if they were newly discovered examples of progress.

As some useful lessons can be drawn from it we will describe the circumstances in which one of these movements, the Bernstein Revisionist Movement occurred. It produced a bitter controversy in the Social Democratic Parties at the turn of the century. What exaggerated the importance of the theoretical dispute was the fact that Bernstein had been a prominent advocate of Marxism for many years, was regarded as an outstanding leader of German Social Democracy, had been a friend of Engels and, along with Kautzky, had been appointed by Engels as one of his literary executors. True, he did not disclose the cloven hoof until Engels was dead.

The controversy was set going by a series of articles on *Problems of Socialism*, contributed by Bernstein to the German Social Democratic paper, the *Neue Zeit*, in 1897. A demand was thereupon made that the German party state its position with regard to his ideas, and particularly to his contention that the task of social democracy was "to organise the working classes politically and develop them as a democracy and to fight for all reforms in the State which are adapted to raise the working classes and transform the State in the direction of democracy."

In 1899 Bernstein published a book containing a complete statement of his views. This book was translated and published in England by the Independent Labour

Party in 1909 under the title *Evolutionary Socialism*, with an English preface by Bernstein. The quotations of Bernstein's views that we will give later on will be taken from this edition, although the controversy ranged round the original German edition.

To begin with, let us see what the views were that Bernstein held. Briefly summarised they were the following:

That the numbers and wealth of large and small Capitalists tended to increase and society to become more democratic. That class antagonisms were being modified by ethical and patriotic considerations. That crises were decreasing in size and frequency through a process of adaptation largely influenced by trusts, cartels and the like. That the Materialist Conception of History overestimated the economic factor; the influence of the economic factor was diminishing whilst the influence of ideological factors, including the ethical, was increasing. That Capitalism had undergone fundamental changes since the middle of the 19th century when Marx made his analyses, but, though true for the time of which he was writing, they no longer applied. That the theory of surplus value was incomplete and needed the addition of the theory of final utility. That the workers have now become



citizens of the country and therefore have a fatherland to defend. That as Germany is becoming more and more dependent upon products from the colonies, these colonies should be developed and protected. Savages have only a conditional right to the land occupied by them; the higher civilization of advanced countries can claim a higher right. That Socialism is a long way ahead and will only come by a process that is gradual and almost imperceptible; consequently we should not worry about the future but concentrate on the present, on the extension of the political and economic rights of the working classes and "In all advanced countries we see the privileges of the Capitalist bourgeoisie yielding step by step to democratic organisations" (Preface, page XI). That the Social Democratic Party should form alliances with the Capitalist parties nearest to them.

These were the views that Bernstein put forward. The controversy that developed was two-fold. On the one hand it was concerned with Bernstein's ideas, on the other it was a struggle to keep him in the Party, in spite of his heresies, on the ground of democracy. On the latter question Liebknecht made the following observations:—

"No socialist, therefore, has the right to condemn attacks on the theoretical ideas of the Marxian teachings or to excommunicate anyone from the party because of such attacks. But it is wholly different when such attacks imply a complete overturning of our whole conception of society, as, for example, is the case with Bernstein. Then vigorous defence is in order." (p. 38, "No Compromise, No Political Trading.")

However, it is well to remember that all the participants in this controversy accepted the reform policies of the Social Democratic Parties. Where they differed among themselves was that some advocated a reform policy but, at the same time, insisted that the Party should remain independent. The muddled attitude of the German party is made plain by a report of the two conferences at which the Bernstein position was debated. The report is taken from the *Social Democrat* of January, 1902.

At a Congress at Hanover in 1899, after Kautzky and Bebel had bitterly attacked Bernstein's views, Bebel moved a resolution that was carried by 216 votes to 21. The resolution began as follows:—

"That the party remains as heretofore on the basis of the class-struggle whereby the freedom of the working class can alone be effected."

But it finished up in this way:—

"The party, without in the least deceiving itself as to the character of the bourgeois parties, does not, on principle, refuse to co-operate with the parties of order from time to time, if the party can thereby obtain some definite advantage, whether for the purposes of election, or in the acquirement of political rights and freedom for the people, or in the event of obtaining some real improvement in the social condition of the working classes, or in the struggle against elements and measures hostile to the masses . . . and has no reason to change either its principles or fundamental demands, or its tactics, or its name."

This weak-kneed resolution in fact gave Bernstein his case for reforms and alliances, and he was not slow to realise it. He was precluded from visiting Germany, and consequently could not attend the Congress. As soon as the terms of the resolution were conveyed to him he telegraphed his willingness to vote for it!

The Congress resolution did not settle the question. The controversy went on, though Bernstein took no part in it until the middle of 1901, when he delivered a lecture in Germany under the title "How is Scientific Socialism Possible?" In this lecture he argued that "to be purely scientific Socialism must cease to be the doctrine of a

class, the expression of the class interests of the working class." This lecture stirred up the flames of controversy again, particularly as the Capitalist press lauded Bernstein as one of their own men. Thus the question came up again at the next Congress, which was held in Lubeck. Bebel opened the attack upon Bernstein, and Bernstein, who was present this time, defended his ideas claiming that he had not attacked the programme, the agitation or the practical working of the party, but only the theory which could not conceivably injure the party, and that he could not recant any of his views.

Two resolutions were moved. The first, for Bernstein, was rejected. The second was carried by 203 votes to 31, and was as follows:—

"The Congress recognises the unreserved right of self-criticism for the intellectual development of the party. But the thoroughly one-sided manner in which Bernstein has conducted his criticism in the last few years, while omitting to criticise bourgeois society and its leaders, has placed him in an equivocal position, and aroused the displeasure of a large portion of his comrades. In the expectation that comrade Bernstein will accept this view and act accordingly, the Congress passes over the resolutions [there were four demanding a formal vote of censure] to the order of the day."

After the resolution was carried Bernstein rose and made the following declaration:—

"As I declared to you at the Congress at Stuttgart, the decision of the Congress naturally cannot cause me to abandon my convictions. At the same time, the decision of the majority of my comrades is never indifferent to me. My conviction is that the resolution is unjust towards me, being based, as I have pointed out, on erroneous suppositions. But since Comrade Bebel has declared that the resolution contains no vote of censure, I declare that henceforth I will respect and observe the decision of the majority of the Congress in the manner due to such a decision."

This ended the dispute over Bernstein's membership as far as the German Party was concerned. In the next contribution we will discuss the repercussions in England of the German party's decision.

We will end this section by pointing out that the ideas Bernstein put forward were not original. He himself had taken them from the Fabians, about whom we will have something to say later on, but there were groups on the Continent holding similar ideas before he put forward his. One of these groups held a view which was described as *Integral Socialism*. A member of this group, Benoît Malon, published a book in 1891 entitled "Integral Socialism." Malon was opposed to Marx's conception of economic motives and class-consciousness, arguing that Socialism was an outlook not for the workers alone but for all humanity, and was inspired by spiritual as well as economic aims, directed at conciliation rather than antagonism of classes, and trying to obtain benefits for all who suffered hardships. An outlook that required the co-operation of the liberal elements in society and involved the moral betterment of the workers.

Believing that Socialism was gradually seeping into society Malon, César de Paepe and others of like conviction, were opposed to any drastic proposals that might interrupt this process and advocated state ownership and the usual multifarious baggage of reformism in their proposals for practical action.

The seeping Socialism must have seeped out as fast as it seeped in, because 60 years later the class struggle has not eased; the workers are still wage slaves of capital and the ruling class is still in the seat of power and opulence.

GILMAC.

(To be continued)

"THE ILLUSION OF AN EPOCH"

H. B. ACTON — Cohen & West

PART I.

Professor Acton has acquired the reputation of being a redoubtable opponent of Marxism. He certainly comes out of his corner fighting and throws every philosophical punch he's got—phenomenalism, positivism, realism, naturalism, etc. At the end Professor Acton holds up Professor Acton's arm and declares Professor Acton the winner.

Although the Professor was billed to fight Marxism he took on a substitute called Leninism. His main philosophical source of reference in his "Illusion of an Epoch" is Lenin's book "Materialism and Emperio-Criticism" which was an excoiating attack on the views of the founders of modern Positivism, Mach and Avenarius.

Briefly, they argued that what is known can only be what is experienced and that itself must depend either directly or indirectly on sense perception. Thus, for example, qualities such as sweetness, hardness, coldness, are congruencies of sensation, as such they are part of what is called sense data and so constitute the indispensable basis for all of our experiences. To say, contended the positivists, that these qualities are independent of our sense-perceived notions and that they have an objective existence in an eternally given matter cannot be proven. Indeed, to say that a substance called matter with all the qualities ascribed to it exists apart from our sense perceptions and our ideas which are directly or indirectly derived from them, is to assert that something exists which itself is inexperienced. Matter, like God, they said is an abstraction not verifiable from sense-experienced data. The most they would commit themselves to was that there existed "the permanent possibility of sensation."

It is true that the positivists' concept of phenomena raised formidable difficulties which on their own admission were never adequately solved. They did, however, seek to overcome the defects of the 18th century materialism which made man the passive instrument of "matter." Many of them asserted that their views were a negation of any form of idealism and supernaturalism.

Lenin in his book contended that matter did exist independently of ideas and possible sense data and that sense perceptions were copies, photographs, images of objective reality. He also contended that acceptance of positivist ideas would lead to idealism, fetishism and solepsism. What made Lenin angry was that some Bolsheviks accepted Mach's views, one of whom was Bogdanov—author of "A Short Course in Economic Science." Bogdanov held that "the physical world was nothing but socially organised experience" and matter "the resistance to collective labour efforts." Nature he regarded as the unfolding panorama of work experiences.

Now Marx himself in criticising 18th century Materialism which saw "Nature" as purely a physical entity showed that natural phenomena enter indirectly into history as a process of material production between men and their natural environment and between men and men. Nature has then a social and historical character and matter is mediated and modified by the social activity of men. Marx and Engels called this Historical Materialism.

Marx, in his "Theses on Feuerbach," said that "the chief defect of hitherto existing materialism including

Feuerbach's was that the given world, reality, sensuousness was only conceived in the form of the object or of contemplation but not subjectively as human sensuous activity." Feuerbach in his criticism of Hegel's idealism had introduced the notion of sense-perceived awareness but failed to grasp the practical character of sensuous productive activity which changed the world and changed men in turn. Feuerbach saw the world as an eternally given reality and not as a socially mediated continuum as well.

Bogdanov added nothing to Marx's "Theses on Feuerbach." Actually, he detracted from it by seeking to give Marxism a non-materialist philosophy when Marx himself had dispensed with philosophy, materialist or otherwise. Bogdanov in fact did not go forward from Marx but back to Spinoza. That philosopher had sought to make God and Nature one. Bogdanov substituted, Man and Nature. By denying any real validity to the physical world he denied man's emergence into it at a point of time. His absolute identification of man with Nature also denied the genuine antithetical features of the unity of Man and Nature and thus denied the main-spring for any genuine historic development.

The main weakness of Lenin's criticism of phenomenalism was his inability to go beyond the limits of 18th century materialism. True he did say that "Marxist Materialism was immeasurably richer in content and incomparably better grounded than all previous forms of materialism" but he never succeeded in explaining what he meant by it. For him Marxist Materialism was the highest development of an unbroken line of revolutionary thought going back to 18th century Materialism. He failed to appreciate that Historical Materialism was a radical break with all other forms of Materialism expressing as it did the changed character of class conflict bound up with the growth of Capitalist society. The standpoint of the old Materialism had been the standpoint of what Hegel had termed "Civic Society." It assumed each individual was an entity in his own right with private feelings and motivated by self interest. It saw the nature of men as a "natural" fact not a social one. All "rights" as natural rights. All social laws "natural laws." Thus was stressed the omnipotence of "matter."

Marxist Materialism on the other hand took the viewpoint of Socialised Humanity. It recognised, however, that a class divided society frustrates its realisation. Only a self-conscious majority comprising the socially productive class could realise it, for this class has no extra social aim to achieve and no other social group to exploit. Marxist Materialism is then the standpoint of the truly human society as opposed to an atomistic one. It is also the highest theoretical expression of a historically matured working class and thus a class Materialism.

Lenin's views in "Materialism and Emperio-Criticism" were hardly any more than a rehash of 18th century Materialism plus Feuerbachism. Like Feuerbach he talked of sensory experience being the criterion of existence but like Feuerbach gave the sensory perceived world the unchanging and immutable character of some eternally imposed pattern of Nature. Marx's rejection of 18th century and Feuerbachian Materialism was sharp and clear. Sensation, Marx said, was not only a bio-

logical mechanism but a social one. This explains why a given physical environment evokes different responses and meanings from subjects derived from different cultures. According to Feuerbach our sense perceptions allowed us to grasp the eternal facts of Nature. What, said Marx, is more likely to meet our eyes were socially linked objects.

Eighteenth Century Materialism saw man as a natural product controlled by natural laws. Marx agreed that Nature was prior to man but showed that the productive activities of men do not come from Nature alone although without Nature his productive activities would be impossible. Men's environment is then pre-supposed in all human activity and constitutes not only a physical environment but a humanised environment; not a "pure" Nature but social Nature. This constitutes Marx's starting point into the investigation of the material basis for social life. It starts therefore, not with a dogmatic assertion about some first cause but with a self-evident proposition. From this proposition that men's social existence consists of the two-fold antithetical character of Nature and material production. Marx formulated the further proposition. "It is not the consciousness of men which determines their social existence but on the contrary their social existence which determines their consciousness." Marx did not then reduce men's existence to some "lifeless" matter or an abstract entity called mind. By qualifying the term existence, i.e.,

social existence it ceased to be a conceptual abstraction and acquired a definite and specific content. Again by qualifying what he meant by existence he qualified what he meant by consciousness and so it ceased to have an indefinable and ineffable philosophic essence but could be shown to be definite historical forms of consciousness consisting of the ideas and specific modes of thinking of social existence itself and the data for this could be drawn from the findings of history.

And if it be asked by the motley crowd of Idealists, Positivists and Neo-Kantians, what do you know of the essence of existence or consciousness we should answer no more than you know about them, but we know where to locate a specific existence and explain determinate forms of consciousness associated with and arising from this existence. And if it again be asked what do Marxists know of Truth? The answer is we are not concerned with Truth, metaphysically posed. We know, however, where to look for the source of particular truths, that is in the actual practices of social life, and if it is posed what criteria are used for judging these particular truths we should reply whether the aims that men have in view bring about consequences which realise the ends they seek to establish. In the second part we shall deal with Lenin's approach to the problem more fully.

(To be continued).

E.W.

CAPITALISM AND LABOUR-SAVING MACHINERY

[The letter below and our reply are a continuation of correspondence in our October issue.—ED. COMM.]

The Editor, THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

I do not dispute the figures regarding the rise of productivity during the years 1939/53 as given by Clark in *Financial Times* 7/2/55, but would point out that these figures are based on years when, first of all, the powers of production were supplying a market and limited by that market and, secondly, six of the years were war years when production for the market had to take second place to war effort and eight of the years were post-war years of reparation and rearmament. Had the second factor not existed that part of workers' labour-power not used productively which is represented by the unemployed would have been very considerable; perhaps greater than ever known.

My point is that under Capitalism the powers of production are retarded by the market, an important part of which is the working-class whose purchasing power is determined by the cost of maintaining themselves as labourers, and the slow increase in all-round productivity as given by Clark is due less to labour-power being transferred from end processes to preceding processes than to the powers of production being limited by the market. Had there been a Socialist revolution on a world-wide scale in 1939, so that the powers of production could have been allowed to supply all human needs, material and cultural, to the full during the 16 years in question the all-over increase of wealth would have been much greater. It is this point which, I think, is not sufficiently stressed in the otherwise excellent article "Automatic Factory" in September issue and a point which a militant attitude to Capitalism ought not to have overlooked.

Yours fraternally,

E. CARNELL.

REPLY

The first point made in the above letter is that the smallness of the average increase in output per worker between 1937 and 1953 must be explained by war and re-armament. This is not correct. The rate of increase was just as small before 1914 and before 1900. Also the estimates of the rate of increase of output per worker include work on armaments. And what is true of this country is true of other countries. Though U.S.A. shows a higher rate of increase than Britain the rate is still small.

Whenever total national production (including armaments) has increased sharply the major factor has been the employment of more workers, working longer hours. The second point appears to be that what Capitalism produces is limited by the market and that if there were greater demand Capitalism would produce more.

This is true of a period when trade is bad and there are many unemployed. The total amount of articles produced would at such a time be increased if demand increased. In other words the Capitalists would produce more if they could sell it and they would be able to produce more by calling in the unemployed.

But this does not apply at a time when Capitalism is in a boom like the present one. Production is now limited by man-power. British Capitalism could and would produce more at the moment, if it could get the workers. As against 200,000 registered unemployed the Ministry of Labour was carrying at 27 July, 1955, 473,000 vacancies for which applicants had not been found.

The demand for many commodities is greater than the supply and the supply cannot be increased because workers are not available. For example, this is true of the coal industry and has led to the importation of coal to the point at which it can go no further because it is

interfering with the import of iron ore. (Minister of Fuel, House of Commons, 1 November, 1955). There are several hundred thousand people able and willing to pay for telephones but who cannot be supplied because labour and materials are not available. Big orders for ships are being placed abroad because the shipyards are too busy to give delivery within the time desired. Man-power shortage affects railways, the Post Office, road transport and local government: even the Police Force is short of 10,000 men.

Our critic tells us that if Capitalism had been replaced by Socialism the production of useful articles would have been very greatly increased. This, of course,

is what the S.P.G.B. has been saying ever since it was founded. But it has nothing to do with the question of the rate at which production per worker increases under Capitalism, or with the limitations Capitalism places on production. Capitalism cannot apply a Socialist solution. The principal features of the Socialist solution that will at once permit the very great increase of useful articles will be the ending of the waste and destruction of armaments and wars, and of such Capitalist activities as banking, insurance, etc., and the availability of a much larger number of people than at present engaged in the production of useful articles.

ED. COMM.

SPREADING SOCIALIST IDEAS

"It is in the nature of every new doctrine to require rather a long time to spread among the masses, to become the prevailing conviction. In ideas, as in life, the new spreads rather slowly, but there cannot be any doubt that it spreads, gradually penetrating deeper and deeper among different strata of the population, beginning with the more developed, of course." (N. G. Chernyshevsky, "Selected Works," p. 87.)

Socialist ideas have been propagated, and developed, for about 100 years, and yet many people are not Socialists. In this country Socialists can be counted in thousands, not in millions; and elsewhere, in other countries, in hundreds or less. But in the words of Chernyshevsky "... the new spreads rather slowly, but there cannot be any doubt that it spreads, gradually, penetrating deeper and deeper..." For after all Socialist ideas are new ideas. One hundred years is not very long in the history of Man. And Socialist ideas could not have developed before the advent of our present-day Capitalist society, which in this country is only a couple of hundred years old, and in many others is only just beginning. Just over 30 years ago Russia and Turkey were still semi-Feudal States. To-day India and China are just emerging as modern industrial nations.

John Ball in the 14th century could say: "... things cannot go well in England until all goods are held in

common... and we shall be equal..." And the French revolutionaries of the 18th century could preach "Liberté, égalité et fraternité," but a society of social equality—Socialism—could not be a practical reality until Capitalism fully developed.

As Socialists here in Britain we think that the acceptance of Socialist ideas is slow. As Socialists we are in a hurry. We must not forget that although many do not consider themselves Socialists ideas do change; in fact are changing all the time.

Although most workers cannot explain just how they are exploited by the employers; just how they create a surplus for the Capitalist class, many feel they are being robbed; many no longer fall for the propaganda that they gain by working hard for the boss. Again, in the first World War many workers volunteered for enlistment in the armed forces. In the last war most had to be conscripted; and it now appears that conscription has become an integral part of present-day Capitalism—for without conscription there would probably be no armed forces worth talking about. At least the workers have come that far!

For the Socialist the job is quite clear. We must explain how Capitalism works; how the workers are exploited; and why Capitalism must be replaced by Socialism.

"PEN."

FREEDOM!!!

FREEDOM is a much-used and much-abused word. Labour and Tory politicians use it. Anarchists are fond of it. What does it mean? More important, what does the Socialist mean when he says that Socialism will be a "free" society?

Are we free to-day? Well, yes and no.

As workers we are free—free from ownership in the means of life; free to go to work as a clerk, a bus driver, a coalminer, for a wage or salary—and free to starve if we refuse to work for an employer. Yes, as modern wage workers we are free; well, almost free; we are not chattel slaves, only wage-slaves! Is that freedom? Freedom to starve if we don't work for an employer? Freedom to be exploited if we do? Well, that's Capitalist freedom. Some freedom!

This is not the "freedom" that Socialists want. This is not the freedom of a "free" society; of a Socialist society as we in the Socialist Party understand it, as we desire it.

Socialism will free mankind from the exploitation of

man by man, from war, from the problems of want and of insecurity.

Socialism will be a really free society because all those things that society needs for its sustenance will be freely available to all. Mankind will freely take, without let or hindrance, all he needs, from the common pool, because the means of living will be the common possession of all—like the air we breathe to-day. Men and women, working in harmony with each other without coercion, will be free to do those things they want to do, those occupations and pursuits that they like; useful work instead of the useless toil so many are forced to do to-day.

In a Socialist society all knowledge and information will be freely available to those who desire it, to use it, unlike to-day where many things are "trade secrets," or even "State secrets."

When Socialists use the words "freedom" or "free society" this is what we mean. Not the sham and make-believe freedom of Capitalism.

PATRICK NEVILLE.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JANUARY,



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

THE FAKING OF REPORTS BY THE BEAVERBOOK PRESS

THE Beaverbrook newspapers the *Sunday Express*, and *Daily Express* have a long record of faking certain kinds of reports. In reporting speeches they consider it legitimate to alter certain words and phrases and present their own doctored version as if it were the original. In our issue for January, 1945, we showed how the *Daily Express* of 2 December, 1944, took a speech made by Mr. Anthony Eden in the House of Commons, altered his specific references to "Labour Government" and to the "hon gentlemen opposite" into "Socialist Government" and "Socialists" and presented this version as Mr. Eden's actual words. Shortly afterwards the *Manchester Guardian* (10 April, 1945), caught the *Sunday Express* (and the *Daily Telegraph*) doing the same with a speech by Mr. Ernest Bevin. The *Manchester Guardian* in a leading article with the title of "Hard of Hearing" doubted if the reporters could be blamed for this and wondered if the true explanation was not a "directive" that this doctoring should always be done. Unable to ignore the *Guardian's* rebuke the *Daily Express* (12 April, 1945), came to the defence of its stable companion, the *Sunday Express*, by explaining that the trouble was about "a mistake in one of the provincial editions" of that paper. But they craftily refrained from saying what the *Guardian* had charged against the *Sunday Express*, so their readers were left in the dark. Of course the explanation explained nothing and the practise of faking has gone on ever since. We are therefore pre-

sumably to believe that by strange coincidence Beaverbrook reporters then and since have been afflicted with a defect of hearing that causes them to go on making the same mistake.

It becomes more curious still when we find that a reporter can be not only deaf but blind. For on 14 June, 1945, the *Daily Express* published what purported to be an extract from an article by Mr. John Yarwood, official of the National Union of General and Municipal Workers,



in the *Union Journal* for June, 1945. In that journal Mr. Yarwood wrote:—

"I admit that we have union members who are professed Conservatives. I can't understand them. Further, there is reason to suspect that considerable numbers who pay lip service to Labour Party policy cast their votes for Conservatives in the secrecy of the ballot. I cannot understand them either."

In the doctored version of the *Daily Express* this became:—

"We have members who are professed Conservatives and members who pay lip service to the Socialist Party and then vote Conservative. I can't understand either."

In 1945 we also took up with "Candidus" of the *Daily Sketch* (not one of the Beaverbrook group) his practice of referring to the Labour Party as the Socialist Party. He dealt with our protest in an article on (1 April, 1945) and gave what we considered the unsatisfactory explanation that he considered it to be a justifiable practice; but at least he gave space to our protest.

The recent attitude of the *Evening Standard* has been quite different. In their issue for 12 October, 1945, they published an article by Sir Beverley Baxter in which he reported the conference of the Labour Party as the conference of the *Socialist Party of Great Britain*. Our letters to him and to the Editor of the *Evening Standard* brought curt replies which made no apology and offered no defence or explanation. We have therefore sent the correspondence to the National Press Council which is to consider the matter. There for the present it rests until we receive the further reply promised by the Council.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," January, 1906)

On a change of Government from Tory to Liberal

At last! After paltering with the destinies of an Imperial race for more years than the Liberal Party care to remember, Mr. Balfour has resigned and the great Unionist Party has gone out of office. At last! After fretting in the shades of opposition for a decade, Sir Herbert Campbell-Bannerman has assumed control of the reins of Government and the great Liberal Party has gone into office. The most capable, the most industrious, the most earnest, the most successful Government of modern times (vide the Tory Press) and the most disgraceful, the most useless, the most fraudulent, the most shameless Government in the history of mankind (vide the Liberal Press) has decided to take a well-earned rest from its laborious endeavours (Tory Press), or has been forced by the pressure of a disgusted public opinion to vacate

its position (Liberal Press), and an impossible Government of virtually warring elements that cannot by any chance conduct the affairs or in any adequate way discharge the responsibilities of the English people (Tory Press), or a Government representative of the brains of the Empire, a sound and workmanlike Government that can unhesitatingly claim to voice the aspirations of every section of the nation (Liberal Press), has taken its place.

A change of names, of labels, of methods—that is all. The interest represented is still Capitalist interest. The object is still the retention of the means of life in the hands of the Capitalist class, still the subjugation and exploitation of the working class. In no single material respect has the Government changed.

NOTES BY THE WAY

So they're going to Clear the Slums, maybe

1851: "Until the year 1851 the legislature appears not to have concerned itself in any way with the quality or quantity of the houses provided in London for the accommodation of persons of the working class. In that year, however, the late Earl of Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley), from his place in the House of Commons, called public attention to the disgraceful condition of the dwellings inhabited by the poorer sections of the labouring class, not only in London, but in the vast majority of large towns all over the kingdom." ("The Housing Question in London, 1855-1900," C. J. Stewart, London County Council, 1900. Page 1.)

1895: "Better Housing for Workers." (Tory Election Address, 1895.)

1933: Number of slums estimated at 472,000 ("Labour Party Handbook, 1951." P. 234.)

London's Shame—The Slums. We must get to work at once (Article in *Evening Standard*, 9 February, 1933.)

1955: "We think there may be about a million slum houses." (Tory Minister of Housing, reported in *Manchester Guardian*, 12/11/55.)

1956-1960: "Housing experts have decided that nearly half of our slums can be pulled down within the next five years." (*Daily Mail*, 9/11/55.)

"L.C.C. accepts plans for demolishing 21,000 houses in 1956-60." (*Manchester Guardian*, 9/11/55.)

"The programme looks promising—on paper. But it is important to remember that more than half . . . of the houses in the 1956-60 scheme are . . . houses that were marked down for destruction under the five-year programme which was launched as long ago as July, 1951." (*Manchester Guardian*, 9/11/55.)

Postscript: An M.P. has hit on the ideal solution for the slum problem. He asked the Minister of Housing not to use the word slums any more.

More Russian Millionaires

Some information from Communist sources about Russia's millionaires is given in our pamphlet "Russia Since 1917," in the chapter "Local Boy Makes Good." More recent information is quoted in *Tribune* (18 November and 9 December, 1955) from a book "The Soviet



Union After Stalin," by H. and P. Lazaroff (Odhams, 16/-). The writers were recently in Russia and had an interview with the director of foreign trade, who confirmed that there are now 930 rouble millionaires, of whom 780 are multi-millionaires. The writers say:—

"The director of foreign trade told us, 'Before the war we only had two. Thanks to social changes in the direction of the peoples prosperity, the number has rapidly increased and will increase still more.'"

The reviewer of the book, Mr. Raymond Fletcher, added that these figures have appeared in the *Russian Press* (*Tribune*, 9 December, 1955.)

Calling Russia by its proper name

Mr. Alastair Forbes in the *Sunday Despatch* (11/11/55) wants Mr. Attlee and Mr. Bevan to explain to Mr. Nehru that Russia is Capitalist:—

"The Soviet leaders have had, whatever cartoonists and leader-writers may suppose, a tremendous success in Asia, where it is high time the masses were told that Soviet Socialism is merely a more inefficient, brutal, and malevolent form of the capitalism that exists under social democracy in the free nations of the West against which Nehru has allowed Indian public opinion to turn.

"Nobody could more suitably tell Nehru of this than Earl Attlee the Liberator.

"And if he wants a glamorous and eloquent companion to share the garlands and golden turbans let him take his fellow picnicker to Peking, Mr. Bevan, and leave the field free to Mr. Gaitskill to clear the political scene at home of the irrelevant political slogans and categories that are overdue for the scrap-heap."

The trouble is that all three gentlemen have the same habit as the Russian leaders, of describing Capitalism as Socialism.

Mr. Bevan and the Bombs

The *Daily Sketch* (3/12/55) reported a B.B.C. Tele-

vision interview with Mr. Aneurin Bevan the previous evening in which he was asked what he would do about the H and A bombs if he became Prime Minister. According to the report he replied that he would abolish the H bomb but would keep the A bomb. As he was a member of the Labour Government that made the A bomb any other reply about that weapon would have needed some explanation, but the reason he gave for regarding the H and A bombs as different propositions was singularly unconvincing.

"Pressed to express the difference, he said the differences of quantity became differences of quality. 'It's like comparing drowning in a bath with drowning in an ocean,' he said."—(*Daily Sketch*, 3/12/55.)

We would have supposed that both ways of drowning led to the victims being equally dead.

Mr. Bevan went on to say that he did not think that the H bomb "either postpones war or brings it nearer." In this he differs from his associate, Mr. Richard Crossman, Labour M.P. for East Coventry (who, it is rumoured, has now moved away from the Bevanite group). Writing in the *Daily Mirror* (25/11/55) Mr. Crossman claimed that with both sides having the bomb the Powers dare not go to war.

"We are at peace today because no Great Power can make war without automatically blowing itself to pieces."

Mr. Crossman is, therefore, in favour of keeping the H bomb as well as the A bomb.

In the meantime the *Manchester Guardian* reports (7/11/55) that the American Government has given urgent instructions to the American military authorities "to widen research into germ and gas warfare, and warfare by the use of radio-active particles." It would appear from this that the American Government does not accept Mr. Crossman's view that large-scale war between the big Powers must either be with the use of the H bomb or not at all. They evidently envisage other possibilities.

One interesting line of inquiry the American military authorities are ordered to explore is the development of "chemicals with a drug-like action" which will "weaken the 'will to fight' of the enemy's military and civilian population without attendant loss of lives or permanent injury." Naturally the Capitalists would prefer to keep alive and fit the working-class goose that lays the golden egg of profit for them.

How the Labour Government kept wages down

Mr. Richard Crossman, who has been a Labour M.P. since 1945 and member of the Labour Party Executive since 1952, has admitted that the social reform measures enacted by the Labour Government were not, in effect, additions to wages but were in place of wage increases. The "wage restraint" policy had the result, he says, of keeping wages lower than they would otherwise have been. He made this admission in an article in the *Daily Mirror* (15/11/55).

"The fact is that, ever since 1945, the British trade unionist could have enjoyed a far higher wage packet if his leaders had followed the American example and extorted the highest possible price for labour on a free market."

"Instead of doing so, however, they exercised extreme wage restraint. This they justified by pointing out to the worker the benefits he enjoyed under the Welfare State—food prices kept artificially low by food subsidies; rents kept artificially low by housing subsidies; rent restriction; and, in addition, the Health Service."

Mr. Crossman sets this out to justify the trade unions in pressing wage claims now that prices are rising again under the Tory Government. If Mr. Crossman had been consistent he would have been urging the trade unions to ignore the Labour Government's plea for "wage re-

straint" in the period 1947-1951 when the cost of living rose by 29 per cent. and wage-rates by only 22 per cent. Perhaps he was doing so but if he was he was one of a small minority among the Labour M.P.s.

Learning from Russia

As Russia emerges as an increasingly powerful competitor in world markets business men are becoming most interested in how industry operates in that country. They think they may be able to learn something useful. Here is an example:—

"Soviet restrictions on trade unionism were commended by Mr. P. J. Wiles, a Fellow of New College, when he addressed the Oxford University Business Summer School here tonight. Suggesting reasons why Russian industry was expanding far more rapidly than that in the West, he said that trade unions there had been virtually abolished, certainly wholly emasculated. Any attempt to enforce restrictive practices was criminal sabotage."

"It is all nonsense this talk about trade unions being a stimulus to economic growth which is sometimes put up by left wing economists," Mr. Wiles said. "The Soviets have the best way with trade unions."—(*Times*, 11/8/55.)

Mr. Cyril Osborne, Tory M.P. for Louth, has been to Russia and Poland and wrote in the *Tribune* about what he saw. Some of the things he saw impressed him greatly and he wants this country to copy:—

"My first surprise was to find their shops are kept open until nearly midnight every night—Sundays included. Unlike ours they are run for the customer's convenience. As I motored back from the London Airport to Westminster it seemed quite wrong to see the London shops being closed at 5.30 p.m. That's the first good lesson we could learn from the Russians."—(*Tribune*, 28/10/55.)

"They do not believe in our old-fashioned Socialist ideas of equal shares. Men get what they earn. Women enjoy equal pay. They do most jobs, except the heavy, dangerous steel work. Nor have they any of our stupid Socialist nonsense about it being unfair to 'ration-by-the-purse.' Their shops are full of goods of varying prices and qualities, and those who earn most buy most—and the best. The others get what they can."

"In Warsaw I saw a pair of women's shoes displayed in the shop window at 1,100 zoloties! That is nearly £100. It represents over a month's wages for the average worker. Who can afford to buy them, I asked."

"Everybody works a 6-day week or 8 hours daily. They have no nonsense about a 5-day or a 35-hour week. And they really do work."

PAMPHLETS

"Questions of the Day"	1/- (Post free 1/2)
"The Socialist Party and War"	1/- " " 1/2
"Russia Since 1917"	1/- " " 1/2
"The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years"	1/- " " 1/2
"The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis"	1/- " " 1/2
"Socialism"	4d. " " 6d.
"Socialism or Federal Union?"	4d. " " 6d.
"The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy"	4d. " " 6d.
"Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?"	4d. " " 6d.
"Nationalisation or Socialism?"	6d. " " 8d.

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

THE PASSING SHOW

Barbarians and history

At one point in Mr. Krushchev's recent journey through Burma he was reported to have said that the British called the Burmese people "savages and barbarians"; and he is supposed to have gone on: "England did not exist before William the Conqueror" (*Daily Herald*, 3/12/55). The publication of these reports called forth denials from the Russians, who said that he had merely been agreeing with a Burmese official who had made these remarks. But what was really interesting about the whole affair was not whether Mr. Krushchev did or did not initiate these comments, but the reaction which their publication drew from the Foreign Office. A spokesman there said that the observation about "barbarians" was "ludicrous"; but he offered no comment about Mr. Krushchev's venture into English history. Now if anything in this matter is certain, it is that the British ruling class did consider the Burmese barbarians and savages; every ruling class considers the colonial peoples under its control to be barbarians, since this belief is a useful propaganda weapon when awkward questions are asked about what right the ruling class has to maintain its empire. The Foreign Office spokesman, however, while denying that part of the alleged statements which was obviously true, left unanswered the other part, which was just as obviously untrue. England had expanded to roughly its present boundaries more than a century before William the Conqueror landed. The Norman ruling class imposed itself upon England; it did not create England.

Cyprus

It is, however, perhaps over-optimistic to expect the Foreign Office to know anything of English history. The behaviour of the Government over the Cyprus question alone is enough to demonstrate its ignorance of that subject. For no one who had read and understood even the last 50 years of the history of this country could ever declare, as the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Harold Macmillan, did recently, that the British would stay in Cyprus permanently, despite the express desire of the great majority of the people of Cyprus that they should go. The course of events in Ireland, in India, in Burma, in Egypt, and in Israel—to name only five outstanding examples—has apparently taught the British ruling class nothing; they still believe that a people which desires to set up an independent state of its own can be coerced into subjection by soldiers and tanks and tear-gas.

Of course, to point out the folly of British policy in Cyprus is not to give any support to the Cyprus EOKA organization. For the struggle now taking place in Cyprus has nothing to do with the class struggle; which goes on in every country between the ruling class and the workers; it has nothing to do with the struggle for Socialism. The ending of British rule in Cyprus will not lead to Socialism, or to any improvement in the conditions of the working class; it will lead only to the assumption of political power by a native Cypriot ruling class.

Self-determination

The events in Cyprus are, however, very revealing in regard to the true opinions and motives of the British ruling class. During the two world wars one of the most profitable of British propaganda plugs was the line about the "defence of democracy" and the "right of small

nations to self-determination." It did not require a very acute observer to see the hypocrisy of this claim. So far from allowing the small nations in the British Empire to have self-determination, the British ruling class refused self-determination even to the large nations like India. In time, however, the realities of the situation forced the British Government to accord self-government to many countries in the empire. It might have been thought at this stage that the British ruling class, which had begun by championing the claims of democracy hypocritically, had ended through the irony of history by championing them sincerely. If anyone ever did think this, the recent occurrences in Cyprus must have restored his faith in the hypocrisy of the British ruling class.

Human Rights

It is not ten years since Britain signed, in an orgy of self-righteousness, the Declaration of Human Rights, which was part of the Charter of the United Nations. That declaration guaranteed to all peoples the right of self-determination. And the Cypriots are demanding nothing more than that Britain should implement that solemnly-understood promise. So official spokesmen are now in the unhappy position of having to explain away the yawning gap between precept and practice. Britain is in favour of self-determination, of course—so they say—but Cyprus must be an exception to the general rule because of its size, or its strategic importance to Britain, or because of the outbreak of terrorism. This last excuse, incidentally, means simply that Cyprus cannot have self-determination because the Cypriots are very eager to have it. The second excuse is the genuine one: Britain intends to perpetuate its rule in Cyprus, even at the expense of the lives of British soldiers, because the British ruling class considers it needs an outpost in the Eastern Mediterranean. So it all boils down to this: the self-interest of the British Capitalist class comes before the principles it has long professed to hold, and the promises it has publicly made.

Oppression

But the Turkish minority in Cyprus, which is variously estimated at between 17 and 20 per cent. of the total population, says this: Suppose we obtained self-government, the Greek majority would vote for Cyprus to become part of Greece. What guarantee would we then have that the Greeks would not oppress us? The answer is quite simple: none at all. Oppression of man by man, and class by class, is an integral part of Capitalist society. Consider some of the other countries for whose "struggle for freedom" our sympathy has been asked (and in some cases demanded, by way of conscription) during the present century. Many Liberals and Fabians upheld the cause of the Boers during the South African War. In 1906 South Africa, which meant the white people of South Africa (and among these the Boers are in the majority) was given Dominion status. What was the result? Why, the oppressed Afrikaners became oppressors of the Bantu; and our modern Liberals and Fabians now attack the very same Afrikaners their fathers defended. Again, the Irish, having succeeded after years of struggle in establishing their right to form a separate state, even though they are in a minority within the British Isles, now deny that Ulster, which is a minority province within Ire-

land, has the right to remain united to Great Britain. The same Belgian ruling class whom British soldiers twice died—in the first and second world wars—to keep in power against the aggression of the German ruling class, has all along oppressed not only the Belgian working class at home, but also the large African population of the Belgian Congo. The Ethiopian ruling class, having succeeded with the help of the British armed forces in throwing off the yoke of Italy, now tyrannizes over the Somalis; and the Egyptian rulers, freed from British oppression, demand the right to oppress the Sudan.

Share of the loot

To join the reformers in their campaigns for the "freedom" of this or that country is to stultify oneself. As fast as one "oppression" is ended, Capitalism throws up another one in its place. The "struggles for freedom" which go on continuously in various parts of the world are in fact nothing more than squabbles over who shall get the greater part of the surplus value which the workers, under Capitalism, are forced to produce.

Comics and violence

On September 14th last the Comics Campaign Council published "British Comics: An Appraisal." The investigating panel found that "far too many stories depended on violence for its own sake, instead of letting violence play a part in the achievement of some worthwhile aim. The ends do not justify the means and children should not inadvertently become accustomed to the idea that they do."

The slogan "the ends do not justify the means" has now become simply an empty shibboleth which nearly everyone repeats and almost no one believes in. Thus the Comics Campaign investigating panel, while repeating the magic words parrot-fashion, have in fact chosen an example which shows that they do believe that the ends justify the means. They deplore "violence for its own sake," but have no objection to it when it is used "in the achievement of some worthwhile aim." And so unaccustomed are people to think logically about the question of ends and means, that (so far as the writer knows) no one has yet pointed out this glaring inconsistency in the report.

Naughty Sexton Blake

But even supposing that the Comics Campaign panel do believe what they say they believe, they would still be merely thrashing the air. What is the use of blaming children's comics for giving the idea that the ends justify the means? By and large a society's literature—and that includes comics—reflects the habits of mind and modes of thought that prevail in the society. And every day, in every country, men in Capitalist society are doing things which cannot be excused on any ground other than that the ends justify the means. How else can one justify the flogging of schoolchildren in Cyprus because they demonstrate in favour of union with Greece? How else can one justify the execution of Africans in Kenya, not even because they are "suspected persons" themselves, but merely because they "associate" with "suspected persons?" And during the last war, were the destruction of Hamburg and Dresden, and the atomisation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, carried out simply as ends in themselves?

It is society itself which displays to children a huge strip-cartoon of crime, violence and brutality; it cannot escape its responsibility by blaming the inevitable results on children's comics.

Two cheers for the Red, White and Blue

The British ruling class has no more fervent supporters than some of our Labourites and Stalinists. When the British film "The Dam Busters" was exported to the United States, it seems that a shot of an American Flying Fortress was introduced into the picture at one point, whereas, as every schoolboy unfortunately knows, all the killing of Germans and the destruction of their work in that attack was done by the Royal Air Force. Clearly the prestige of the coercive forces of the British Capitalist class was at stake, and Mr. S. T. Swingle, the Labour M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyme, rose in his place in the House of Commons to demand that some protest be made to the American authorities. The *Daily Worker* also realized the issues involved, and reported Mr. Swingle's intervention approvingly under the heading "Protest over film trick" (17/11/55).

Our ruling class need never fear while such doughty warriors as these are on the watch for anything which might affect the prestige of British Capitalism.

ALWYN EDGAR.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

Head Office Sunday evening lectures with film illustrations are being continued each week. They are proving very interesting, each film that is shown is followed by a talk by a Party speaker who explains the Party's views on the subject being dealt with. Details of the January lectures are shown in this issue. There is time for questions and discussion after each talk.

Bloomsbury Branch will not be holding meetings at 32, Percy Street, after the end of December. It is hoped that a further series of meetings will be held later, either at the same address or elsewhere in Central London.

Glasgow (City and Kelvingrove Branches) are continuing their Sunday evening meetings at Central Halls, Bath Street, at 7.30 each Sunday. The Branch Organisers

would like members and sympathisers to stimulate discussion by asking questions, it helps to make the meetings more lively and interesting.

On Wednesday, November 16th, Leyton Town Hall was the scene of a public debate "Socialism or Liberalism?" between R. Coster, for the Socialist Party of Great Britain, and Evan Richards, Liberal Party candidate for Leyton.

About 180 people listened attentively as the Socialist case was stated. Drawing attention to the multifarious problems of to-day, the speaker described the Capitalist system of production and how it gave rise to these problems. The Liberal Party was incapable of solving them because it wanted Capitalism to continue: Socialism, based on a complete change in the mode and motive of

production, was the only solution.

Evan Richards said he was not daunted by the indictment he had heard. Nobody was perfect, and the Liberals did not pretend to have all the answers; by saying that, he believed he had answered most of what his opponent had said. He went on quickly to the Liberals' list of palliatives, which included colonial freedom, profit sharing, house ownership and harder work, and referred to Socialism as "a cloudy vision."

After a period of questions from the audience, Richards made his second speech, which largely reiterated what he had said before. He jeered at the suggestion

that anybody was badly off to-day—look, he said, at the housing estates bristling with television aerials. The Socialist speaker, closing the debate, took up the phrase which had been used of Socialism: the real "cloudy vision" was the Liberals'—the vision of Capitalism without its consequences. While pro-Capitalist parties pursued that mirage, the need for Socialism became more urgent every day.

The audience showed unmistakably their conclusion from what they had heard and their boredom with the Liberals' uninspired flogging of dead Capitalist horses. There was a good collection towards the cost of the debate P. H.

AUSTRIAN DEMOCRACY

IN their political innocence or inexperience, a number of workers in a Vienna automobile factory left the "Socialist" party-controlled Trade Union as a protest against the Union's passive attitude to various grievances including a 50 per cent. increase of the city's tramway and bus fares. Others distributed leaflets calling upon fellow-workers to join another union—with the result that the factory owners, supported by the "Socialist" trade union, sacked the malcontents. Is Vienna in Russia? No, but your confusion is pardonable for the reason that the city is called "red" Vienna, and that such things as victimising people for expressing opposite political views are thought to be typical only for countries behind the iron curtain. Let us further enlighten you and say that if such persecution does not happen here on a larger scale, it is because among the 100,000 State employees and workers of the huge "red" Vienna's municipal enterprises there are few innocent or foolhardy enough to risk their jobs, i.e., the only share of the country's wealth that Capitalism has left them after centuries of struggle and technical progress. The mass of the workers at the Post-Office, on the State railways and other nationalized industries, on the municipal tramways and buses, in the electricity and gas works and the rest of the huge municipal profit-making concerns know that the much vaunted freedom of speech, of criticism and democracy, does not go so far as to allow open criticism of the State's exploiting system to pass with impunity. Even though that punishment is not as severe as in "right to work"—Russia where malcontents and those guilty of "subversive activity" are deported to forced labour camps, workers in our "free world" are wary of jeopardizing their jobs.

Let us hope that the victims, having probably been cured of their error of accepting the shadow for the substance of democracy, will now also have learned that, as far as the workers are concerned, the rest of the wordy professions of equality, freedom of association, independence and social justice are little more than illusions, deceit and fraud.

As was only to be expected, the incidents at the automobile factory, while embarrassing to the S.P., were a welcome opportunity to their opponents, who are not slow to make political capital out of it. The Federal Chancellor, whose party dealt that crushing blow to Austrian social democracy in 1934, now poses as the Lord Pro-

tector of democracy. He declined to attend the opening session of the Trade Union Congress that happened to be sitting in Vienna, "until this matter has been satisfactorily cleared up, until justice is done to the victims, and democracy restored!"

As against this nauseating show of hypocrisy, another incident glaringly portrays the real attitude of governments towards the working class. It arose over the handling of affairs in connection with the execution of the State Treaty after the end of the Russian control over hundreds of large and small industrial enterprises. As is now common knowledge, the return of part of these Concerns was made subject to a payment of 150 million dollars to Russia in addition to a whole series of other heavy concessions (see *SOCIALIST STANDARD* for July 1955). With so much talk of Austria re-entering at last into possession of her patrimony (Austria for the Austrians, you know), and the other usual platitudes and patriotic tunes, the illusion is ever fostered that the country belongs to the people—all evidence to the contrary, as an for example their continued poverty—notwithstanding. In reality, the Concerns which had been seized as war-booty (German property) were owned by a bunch of international Capitalist investors. The American, British, Dutch interests in the Austrian oil fields and other industries are notorious, while the others are less widely known. Certainly not a particle of any of these sources of wealth belongs to the workers employed therein, and it must be a matter of perfect indifference to them whether the shareholders are Austrian or foreigners. Indeed, it would be hard for any foreign exploiter to beat German and Austrian Capitalists' talents for organizing the extraction of surplus-value, i.e., profit, from other people's labour.

Yet, a delegation of workers from the Austrian Fiat Automobile Works could be induced by labour leaders to go to the Finance-Ministry and demand the cancellation of a meeting of shareholders which was to formally sanction the re-transfer of the Italian Fiat's 51 per cent. holding. Since the workers are generally acquiescing in a small clique owning and controlling all the means and instruments of wealth production and distribution, why— you may ask—should they single out this particular Concern for their protestations? What difference would it make to them if the Fiat Works were even to renounce all their rights and titles to the factory in favour of Austria, i.e., the Austrian Capitalist State?

Of course it would make no difference to the slaves producing the goods, but the Austrian CAPITALISTS who have to pay 4,000 million Austrian Schillings to Russia for relinquishing their control over these Concerns, now fear that their money will all be "thrown out of the window." "What happens today with Austro-Fiat," the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* laments, "can to-morrow happen with dozens of other enterprises." In the end, they say, "it would come to this that of all the German property for which 'we' must pay 4,000 million to Russia, nothing is left to the Republic." "We may only pay, but do not get anything for it."

So the workers were mobilized, i.e., misused for and misled into some action (there was also a short strike) on behalf of their masters. How State employees fare under Capitalism, the railway, postal and all other workers know only too well. And as there can be no question of the Italian Fiat owners handing over to the WORKERS, it is clear that their position could not alter even one iota under any other transfer of property rights.

But, as already said, some of the workers having been persuaded that their interests were at stake, a delegation went to see the Finance Ministry to demand the cancellation of the shareholders' meeting. The reply of the State Secretary (a political rival of the S.P.) was not only a sharp refusal of the workers' demand, but he added defiantly that he would do everything he could to ensure the holding of the meeting. He pointed out that the shares were rightly in the hands of the Italian Fiat group and that they could decide what was to be done. (The meeting has since been held.) At the same time the State Secretary bluntly told the workers' delegates "to mind their own business." Socialists will not be accused of holding briefs for Capitalists or their henchmen, but we must agree with this one, advising the workers to mind their own business. Their business is, of course, not to assist Capitalist cliques in fighting out their quarrels with one another, whether in

State chancelleries or on the battlefields, but to organize and vote for the removal of Capitalism and its managers, administrators and labour leaders, from the face of the earth.

Of the few freedoms that have not yet become mere illusions, the Right to Vote is the most important. With dependency on the employing class (private or State) for your means of livelihood, there can be no real democracy for you. Yet it is still enough, at least in the Western world, to lay the evil ghost that is haunting humanity, to exorcise the demon capital, to oust it from its nefarious rule, and to lay the foundations for a sane order of things: Socialism, whenever the people are ready and wish to have it.

The working-class hold the overwhelming majority of the votes, and there can be no question of sacking or otherwise victimizing you for casting your vote AGAINST the continuation of the present barbaric system, and FOR revolutionary Socialism. By such action you can at the same time help your brothers behind the iron curtain to rid themselves from the Bolshevik octopus and nightmare.

Therefore, when you are again asked to vote, remember it is the most important thing in your lives! Only, to cast an intelligent vote, presupposes UNDERSTANDING of the functioning of the decrepit system under which you live—knowledge that will almost automatically introduce you to Socialism and answer the questions and doubts which may assail you, concerning its practicability. To disseminate and impart that essential knowledge, is the purpose of the S.P.G.B. and companion parties. Year in, year out, their members, pamphlets and periodicals, do their best to spread the message of Socialism.

Perusing some former editions of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, this writer chanced upon a Comrade's "Christmas Carol" in last December's issue, ending with the words with which I wish to end my to-day's message: "Understand . . . understand . . . understand!"

R. F.

THE TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

FORENSIC Science Laboratories, Fork and Spoon Manufacturers, Territorial Army Depots, Tanners, Parchment Manufacturers, Steeplejacks, Zip Fastener, Foot Appliance, and Flower-pot Manufacturers, Farmers, Advertising Agents, Actuaries, Booksellers, Diamond Cutters, Fish Friers, Doctors, Florists, Glass Bottle Makers Laundries: the pages of the Telephone Directory turn over to reveal more and more names and addresses and an ever-widening variety of occupations. The large variety of skills so indicated have themselves given rise to a further specialisation—that of publishing Classified Directories.

It is, of course, the individuals working in these concerns who possess the skill. The companies concerned buy the labour-power from workers, whether they be typist, bank-manager, van-driver or engineer, to further the process of production or distribution. The goods or services normally being sold at a price which not only recompenses the Capitalist for his outlay but provides him with a profit.

Some of the trades are further sub-divided; the Electrical Industry for example is sub-divided into Manufac-

turers of Accumulators and Batteries, Bells, Blankets and Pads, Cable, Carriages and Vehicles, Clocks, and so on for 55 sub-divisions. Each of these concerns make use of a wide variety of skills within that specified industry including of course the worker or workers whose job is to hire labour.

Chemists, Bank-note Printers, Solicitors, Nationalised Railway Boards, Showcase Makers, Fashion Publishers, Employment Agents, Gin Distillers, Bailiffs, Dieticians, Dentists, Signwriters. . . . A consideration of the jobs that are listed gives a view, as through a keyhole but valid nevertheless, of the society in which we live, for when we read between the lines of the prosaic Telephone Book we look into a veritable mirror of social production. The sub-division of labour means that practically anything produced is a result of the application of a large number of skills; that is to say, the workers *socially produce* the commodities and services that are available. But the means of production and the commodities produced are *privately owned*. How about all of us carrying co-operation a step further by working together in the Socialist movement to institute a system of society where the means

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

ADDRESSES OF COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA, P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Australia.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, P.O. Box 115, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND, P.O. Box 133, G.P.O., Dublin, Eire.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND, P.O. Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, Room 307, 3000 Grand River, Detroit 1, Michigan, U.S.A.

The SOCIALIST STANDARD, WESTERN SOCIALIST and other Socialist literature can be obtained from the above.

of wealth production are *commonly owned*? We maintain that this is the only way to create a harmonious society where the labourers will be exploited no longer. In other words: WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE. YOU HAVE ONLY YOUR CHAINS TO LOSE, YOU HAVE A WORLD TO WIN.

F. OFFORD.

GROUPS

Will anybody interested in forming a Group or desiring any other information about Groups, apply to Group Secretary, at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

Correction

The 37th line, 2nd col., of the article "The A.B.C. of Anarchism" in December "S.S." should read: . . . "Ernestan, was quoted in *Freedom* (1/3/52) as saying:—" instead of . . . writing in *Freedom* . . . said:—"

NOTTINGHAM BRANCH LECTURE

at
CO-OP HALL, PARLIAMENT STREET, NOTTINGHAM
at 7 p.m.
Sunday 29th January: (Title and Speaker to be announced)

PADDINGTON DISCUSSIONS

"THE HARCOURT ARMS,"
32, HARCOURT STREET, W.I.
(Off Marylebone Road, near Edgware Road Station)
Every Wednesday at 8 p.m.

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park	...	3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m.
East Street	...	
(Walworth)	Jan. 1st	11 a.m.
	" 8th	12.30 p.m.
	" 15th	11 a.m.
	" 22nd	12.30 p.m.
Whitestone Pond	...	
(Hampstead)	" 29th	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park	...	11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.
Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—Group meets alternate Wednesdays, 11th and 25th Jan., 7.30 p.m., York Room Green's Playhouse.

EDINBURGH—Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 4th and 18th Jan., 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

RUGBY—Group meets alternate Mondays 2nd, 16th and 30th Jan., at 7, Paradise Street. Correspondence: Sec. c/o above address.

HACKNEY BRANCH LECTURE

at the
CO-OP HALL, 197 MARE STREET, E.8.
at 8 p.m.

Monday 16th January: "Leonardo and History"
E. KERSLEY

MANCHESTER BRANCH LECTURE

at the
MILTON HALL, DEANSGATE, MANCHESTER
at 7.30 p.m.

On Friday 27th January: "Socialism—Reality or
Myth?" A. G. ATKINSON.

A programme of
DOCUMENTARY FILMS
will be shown at

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET
Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.
(Between Clapham North and Clapham Common
Tube Stations)

January 1st: "The World is Rich" E. LAKE

This film is a successor to World of Plenty and deals with the post-war food situation.

January 8th: "Leonardo Da Vinci (The Tragic Pursuit of Perfection)" E. KERSLEY

Directed by Enrico Fulchignoni. Music by Pierre Henry and Pierre Scheffer, Narrator Alan Badel. Produced by Theadora Olembert.

This traces the life and genius of the artist through the medium of his drawings, paintings and designs, showing his many varied interests.

January 15th: Glimpses of South Africa (Industry) J. O. BOUCHER

A general view of industry in South Africa, laying emphasis on the country's vast natural resources and the building-up of industries on modern lines.

After Sixty Years

The story of Johannesburg from the first discovery of gold on the city's site in 1884 to the present day. The film describes all the varied functions of the City Council in the modern running of the city.

January 22nd: "Look, Mum—Soldiers" H. BALDWIN

This film, through a conversation between a barber and his customer, gives an idea of the Army—including the Territorial Army.

January 29th: The Londoners P. LAWRENCE

The story of London's housing, health and education services during fifty years of democratic local government; made to celebrate the jubilee of the L.C.C.

February 5th: Children of the Ruins C. WILSON

The work of U.N.E.S.C.O. to deal with the ill effects on children's bodies and minds of the chaotic conditions of the inter-war and war years all over the world.

Refreshments available after Meeting.

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (5th and 19th Jan.)

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, Vera Barrett, 26, Harbour Crescent, Wibsey, Bradford or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

CROYDON Enquiries to Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCELES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA Correspondence and enquiries to Jon Keys, 6, Keppel House, Lucan Place, Chelsea, S.W.3. Outdoor meetings, Gloucester Road, Wednesday evenings, 8 p.m. and Earls Court, Friday evenings, 8 p.m.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 2nd, 16th and 30th Jan., at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to Maurice Shea, 31, Goldsmiths Row, Shoreditch, E.2.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to A. D. Oliver, 13, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (4th and 18th January) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. Secretary: 54, Ashdale House, Seven Sisters Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. A. Fisher, 59a, Duncombe Hill, S.E.23.

LEYTON Branch meets Mondays 8.0 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10. Lectures and Discussions held 2nd and 4th Monday in each month. Secretary, D. Russell, c/o H.O., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 10th and 24th Jan., George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. J. M. Breakey, 2, Dennison Ave., Withington, Manchester, 20. Didsbury 5709.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m., "The Harcourt Arms," 32, Harcourt Street, W.1. (off Marylebone Road, near Edgware Road Station). Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to H. G. Cottis, 109, Kingswood Chase, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to Secretary, Dick Jacobs, c/o 13, Waterloo Place, Brynmill, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road, Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

GLASGOW (CITY AND KELVINGROVE) BRANCHES
SUNDAY EVENING LECTURES

at
CENTRAL HALLS, BATH STREET, GLASGOW
7.30 p.m.

Jan. 8th Bullets v. Ballots, R. Reid.
" 15th "Full Employment," J. Richmond.
" 22nd "Gradualism and Revolution," A. Shaw.
" 29th "Can We Disarm?" B. Webster.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 618 Vol. 52 February, 1956

The Decline of the Music Hall

WHERE ARE THE TRADE
UNIONS GOING?

"WE'RE NOT PAUPERS
OF COURSE"

MARIE CURIE

ARE THE TEACHERS
LEARNING?

LORD AMWELL AND THE
LABOUR PARTY

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

^D
4

IN HIS BOYHOOD, this writer went often to the Palace. No royal residence this; it was in the High Street, and men sold hot potatoes and chestnuts outside. Inside, it was all plush and pilasters, cherubs and chandeliers, with three gold-painted balconies receding one above another into the incredibly high domed roof. The higher you went the cheaper it was, from two shillings in the front stalls to fourpence in the gallery, where the seats were wooden steps and the tickets metal discs. There, his young blood chilled at "Sweeney Todd"; he heard and saw Harry Champion, Kate Carney and Vesta Victoria, and joined in choruses which now are almost folk-songs—"Any Old Iron," "Waiting at the Church," and "Nellie Dean."

The Palace was a roaring music-hall in the days before the wireless and the talkies. Now it is near-derelict. By itself, that might mean little; there are derelict churches, but the mumbo-jumberry goes on. In this case, however, a minor epoch in social life has come to an end. Indeed, it had ended before the last few unsuccessful attempts to keep the Palace open with repertory, bands and nude shows. Along with the Palace, fifty others in London are boarded-up or become cinemas now: the music-hall, once the great working-class entertainment, is dead.

Fifty years ago there were seventy of them in London, and a comparable number in the big provincial cities and in Paris and New York. In addition, there were a good many local theatres providing stuff which had a clear relationship to the music-hall—domestic comedy, melodrama, and such *pieces de resistance* as Lawson's "Humanity," in which an entire room (furniture, doors, pictures, and, of course, piles of crockery) was smashed nightly. Today there are not more than a dozen variety theatres in London, and the decline has been similar elsewhere.

Chief among the immediate causes is, of course, the rise of the cinema. In 1914 moving pictures were a novelty, but by the end of the war they were an American industry with a ready market in Britain. That in itself was not catastrophic to the music-hall, however. In the nineteen-twenties most cinemas were small and anything but Regal, Majestic or Super (at one bearing the last name you sat on wooden forms, and the pictures blurred when trains went by); films flourished, undoubtedly, but older people were prejudiced against them and the higher-income groups looked down on them.

The catastrophe was the coming of talking pictures. Within a year of their arrival, bigger and better cinemas were going up all over Britain; the first victims of the talkies, in fact, were the small picture-houses—either gobbled up or pushed out of business by the syndicates. The new cinemas' splendour, in every architec-

tural style from Byzantine to Classical Revival, put the old Palace in the shade. And admission was cheap: bear in mind that talkies arrived in Britain in 1929, at the beginning of the slump. Mass unemployment may have contributed a great deal to cinema-addiction. For threepence or fourpence you could not merely buy a dream; you could sit for several hours in warmth and comfort (some cinemas even gave cups of tea in the afternoons).

The reasons for the music-hall's decay go deeper, however. The appearance of a new social pursuit does not necessarily mean the decline of another. It may be an addition, not an alternative. The rise of television, for example, has not ousted the cinema, which in 1955 showed increases in admissions and takings over previous years. What has passed is not a form of entertainment but the social pattern of which it was part—the sort of life which produced music-halls and the social consciousness which was expressed in them.



The music-hall was not an off-shoot of the theatre: it had different roots and a different function. It originated simply as tavern entertainment, the singing of cheerful songs with choruses for everyone to join in. Because public houses were centres of social life, popular entertainment remained in them; the more so since the upper class made "serious" music and the theatre its own amusements. Thus developed the "free-and-easy," where a chairman gave order to the proceedings but they remained an accompaniment to eating and drinking.

The music-hall as such began when public houses made special accommodation for entertainment—"saloon theatres," where the audience ate, drank and smoked through it all. In the mid-nineteenth century there were frequent prosecutions for presenting bits of drama and opera, those being outside the licensed province of the saloons; when the restrictions and prosecutions ended, music-halls on the theatre pattern began to be built. Most music-hall buildings date from between 1880 and 1900.

In one sense, the decline of the music-hall could be said to have begun then, with the setting-up of the foot-light barrier and the performers becoming highly-paid artistes. In fact, however, the old traditions persisted. There was still a lot of drinking in music-halls, though it had to be done outside the auditorium (according to accounts, the appearance of a weak turn would provoke a wholesale exodus to the bars); conviviality remained the keynote, and performers used the same material for years, knowing that their audiences expected and wanted to join in long-familiar songs.

The essence of the music-hall was what the modern entertainments industry calls "audience participation." That was not merely a matter of singing choruses and shouting responses; it involved the whole of the music-hall's material. The performers had the same working-class background as the audiences (respectable people 60 years ago would rarely let their sons and daughters go on the ordinary stage, let alone the music-halls): Harry Champion was not a man who "did" Cockney songs but a real, raucous, Cockney-speaking Cockney. Their humour was less devised than distilled from everyday life in pub, street and kitchen; so, too, their sentiment.

Neither the humour nor the sentiment goes down today, of course. Both came from a recognition of common (often earthy) joys and misfortunes. Albert Chevalier personating the old man rescued from the workhouse and singing "My Old Dutch" brought tears to the eyes of strong men—because the separation of husband from wife in the workhouse was all too often the fate of the old. Something similar can be said of almost every music-hall song. They celebrated food and drink, made wry humour out of nagging wives and perfidious husbands, were sentimental over illness, absence and death.

For various reasons, that background faded and when it had happened the music-hall was dead. The State assumed more and more responsibility for children, the ill and the old. Popular newspapers and magazines pushed ideas of genteelness at the newly board-school-taught public; the man who had met his doom at Trinity Church kept quiet about it. And beer-drinking diminished, as public houses ceased to be centres of social life; with it, the scenes and episodes which were its consequences.

The decline of the music-hall is part of the disintegration of community life which has taken place in this century. There is nothing communal about the cinema: everybody comes in and goes out at a different time from everybody else, appreciation is individual, and the performance goes on regardless of the audience's response. A good many people, in fact, scarcely go to see the film at all (at least one cinema in East London before the war had double seats for the amorously inclined). The cinema is entertainment for a society congested with lonely individuals, where life is too split-up and "private" to allow either the communal enjoyment or the common recognition of poverty and misfortune from which the music-hall drew its vigour.

Mention is often made of a seeming loss of vitality from everyday life in the last 25 or 30 years. George Orwell, in "The Road to Wigan Pier," refers to a "Punch" cartoon of the nineteenth century in which a bunch of street-boys are saying: "Ere comes a swell! Let's frighten 'is 'oss!" and comments that nowadays "they would be much likelier to hang round in vague hopes of a tip." The music-hall of not so many years ago would provide much more food for that contention,

when the audiences were uninhibited in their reactions to performers. The writer once heard a character actor break off a Shakespeare declamation to say: "Yes, and if I come up there you won't be so—clever, my lad!"

The real point, however, is that so much of former communal activity and responsibility for living has now been handed over to authority-bearing specialists. It used to be the poor that helped the poor: now it is the State. Similarly, former objects of common concern, sentiment and indignation are now the subjects of State ministration. "Standing up for one's rights" nowadays means writing letters of complaint to the right quarters.

It is too easily taken for granted that the days of the music-hall were "bad old days" (except by those who assume the very opposite because "a pound was a pound," as if everyone really did have five times as much money before 1914). Obviously there is not much to be said for drunkenness, street fights and so on that were common sights, and still less to be said for the workhouse system of those days. What is overlooked is that the breaking-up of community life has created different sorts of problems. A good deal is heard today about the in-

crease in incidence of mental and nervous diseases, but few people ask why it is happening.

One reason, at least, is that the atomizing of social life frustrates one of man's greatest needs—for recognition and acceptance by his fellows. Twentieth-century civilization is an unsatisfactory world for most of the people in it, largely for that reason. In spite of the mechanization of work and leisure, neither gives much satisfaction to most men and women: the mass frustration and lack of fulfilment implicit in 99 out of a 100 films and novels is itself a condemnation of modern civilization.

The first object of social organization is the satisfaction of people's needs: that is what first brought men out of caves and trees to form tribes and communities. Our society does not do that. Indeed, it does not aim at doing it: it places sale and profit above all other things, and makes commodities of the means of satisfying needs. The world represented by the music-hall had many undesirable features: because ours is in some ways different, that does not mean it is in many ways better.

R. COSTER.

THE FABIANS, BERNSTEIN AND REVISIONISM (Continued)

THE action of the German Social Democratic Party in deciding to overlook the theoretical and practical delinquencies of Bernstein raised a heated controversy in the columns of the English social democratic journal, the *Social Democrat*.

The controversy opened with a somewhat vitriolic article by Belfort Bax entitled *Factitious Unity*, which appeared in the *Social Democrat* of February, 1902. The article opens with some general remarks about unity. He claimed that there was a strong tendency in advanced parties to make a fetish of party unity and that "The integrity of principles is quite a secondary consideration provided that the unity of the party be maintained. Anything to avoid a split—that is the motto of the practical politician in the dawning 20th century." He then suggests that it would be well for the advocates of unity at any price to ask themselves for what their party exists. If it is for money, office, or power for its own sake, then unity may be justified in its day and generation. But, "If, on the contrary, party organisation itself is subservient to certain definite ideals, and has no object or significance apart from such, then equally clearly, whenever those ideals are threatened by the unity of the party, that unity must go by the board."

Coming indirectly to the question of Bernstein, Bax examines the claim for unity by those who argue that it is better to patch up differences of opinion that may exist and "unite on a basis of some vague and general formula on which all can agree," and who claim "that a party cannot afford to lose an able man or men merely because they happen to be shaky on some vital point of principle."

To the first point Bax replies "the realisation of the ideals of a party is less likely to be effectuated by the attenuation of those ideals for the sake of mere numerical strength than by the surrender of a certain amount of such strength on behalf of the vigorous maintenance intact of the principles for the sake of which the party avowedly exists." Against the second point he contends that "the ability of doubtful members cuts both ways. It may be of more danger to party principles when inside the party

organisation than it is of advantage to the enemy when working against it outside. A party having any regard for its principles should surely look to it that its able men . . . should be straight even more than the rank and file—and, hence, if they go wrong, should be the more inexorably expelled. A party that is worth its salt can always afford to lose a man or two without collapsing, but it cannot always afford to have a powerful leader inside incessantly pulling the wrong way."

After some references to the Liberal and Radical parties of the time Bax then comes to the attitude of the German Social Democratic Party towards Bernstein, at which his article was really aimed. We will have to quote nearly the whole of his final paragraph in order that what follows will be understandable.

After stating that the glorification of unity is not confined to Liberalism he continues:

"We see much the same thing at the present time among our comrades of the German Social Democratic Party. It has been of late crucially manifested in the Bernstein controversy. Mr. Bernstein repudiated almost every principle hitherto regarded as 'of faith' in Social Democracy. He champions every form and well-nigh every abuse of capitalism. . . . He has systematically attacked every Social Democratic doctrine in turn, to the delight of reactionary readers and hearers. In a word, Mr. Bernstein is incomparably less friendly to Socialism, if any meaning is to be attached to the word at all, than the mildest English Radical. To judge from his expressed opinions, in fact, Mr. Bernstein has no more sympathy with the recognised principles of Social Democracy, and perhaps rather less, than Count von Bulow himself. And yet, wonderful to relate, for fear of causing a split in the party, for fear of jeopardising party unity, the German Social Democrats could not muster up sufficient courage to exclude Mr. Bernstein from their ranks. In this case the mere desire of preserving a formal unity must be alone in question, since it can hardly be alleged that there is any extraordinary ability at stake."

In the March, 1902, number of the *Social Democrat*, J. B. Askew replied to Bax, defending the attitude of the German Social Democratic Party, contending that the German party had considered the whole circumstances of the case and not merely the points raised by Bax. He

then gives a lengthy outline of the matters in dispute, largely in accordance with the summary we gave in our last month's contribution; but he omitted Bernstein's support for war and his claim that the "higher" civilisation had a greater right to the territory of native people than the natives themselves.

After his statement of matters in dispute, he writes:

"Now it is fairly obvious that this theory or theories are open to dispute, and, indeed, I think that Kautsky has completely proved the worthlessness of most of Bernstein's speculations, but that is a very different thing from thinking with Bax that it was advisable to expel him from the party on the strength of them."

He then argues that if Bernstein were expelled for his criticisms,

"We tie the party down to a formula, which nobody is allowed to criticise under penalty of expulsion, a proceeding which is consistent from those who consider that Final Truth has been achieved in this direction, but very stupid for those who do not. After all what is a political party, or, rather, what is the Social Democratic Party, and what are the conditions of membership? The answer is, surely, we are a body of men and women who have come together to work for the achievement of ideas which we have embodied in a common programme, the most important item of which is that of the socialisation of the means of production and exchange. Membership of the party is conditional on acceptance of this programme and the agreement to work for the common end. Bernstein accepts both these conditions. . . . There is a difference. I may remind Bax, between saying that Bernstein is inconsistent in remaining in the Party and thinking that the party would do well to turn him out."

Finally, after having a dig at Bax's criticism of the Materialist Conception, and suggesting that he is in the same position as Bernstein. Askew winds up as follows:

"I am against expulsion—as I believe the German Party is—in cases where the theory of the Party alone is concerned, and there is no question of Party discipline or character at stake, because I believe that if we are to progress as a Party, if we are to meet the difficulties, which will confront us, our members must enjoy a full, free, and unlimited right of criticism in respect of the Party programme. To deny this is to imply that we have attained Final Truth, and that new circumstances can never arise to alter it, or render a new tactic and programme necessary."

Before we go on to Bax's reply to Askew's contribution we must interpolate a few remarks of our own on the above.

The argument about Final Truth in connection with the matters in dispute seems plausible until it is examined, then it becomes comical. For example. If a naked man stands upright in the path of a modern express train he will be killed; likewise, if a thousand tons of rock drops on a naked man he will also be killed. These are final truths within the conditions of the statements; there can be no doubts about them, either now or in a thousand years.

Now let us come to the question of Socialist principles.

Present society is based upon the ownership of the means of living by the Capitalist class; there is an antagonism of interests between the owning class and the producing class: this antagonism of interests must continue as long as there is buying and selling. Capitalist ownership and capital investment, and a class that lives by selling its physical and mental energies to an owning class. These conditions can only be removed by a social revolution accomplished by the subject, or producing class. These are statements of fact and final truths for the conditions specified as far as Socialists are concerned. Further, reforms cannot alter the conditions because they do not aim at abolishing the present basis of society.

This is also a final truth for the conditions specified. Again, wars, insecurity, crime, and a host of other evils, will continue whilst the present social basis remains. This, again, is a final truth for the condition specified.

Askew's Final Truth argument would therefore appear to have no bearing upon the matters in dispute. In fact, however, it has for the disputants. What hipped all of Bernstein's opponents in the dispute was the lengthy reform programmes and compromising of the Social Democratic Parties. Here there was no final truth, because no sooner was one reform adopted than another was required to meet the effects of the previous one. Many of the reforms advocated by the Social Democratic Parties during the eighties and nineties have been adopted, yet still the fundamental social position remains unchanged—Capitalists and workers, domination and class-struggle, wars, insecurity, crime, and the rest of the social evils. Yet still the reformers pursue their will-o-the-wisps. This reformism is what Askew means when he refers to "a common programme" in the above quotation. To him Socialism consists of two antagonistic parts—the accomplishment of common ownership and a policy of reformism. Reforms, however well intended, are designed to enable the exploiting machine to run more smoothly; not to remove the machine, but to take some of the sand out of it. To bemuse the discontented and induce them to work harder and complain less.

Now to return to the controversy.

Bax's reply to Askew appeared in the *Social Democrat* for June 1902. His answer to Askew's Final Truth argument was as follows:

"I answer, it is a party, at all events, possessing certain principles, political, economical, and ethical, based on the known facts of historic evolution. Any one who sets himself up by sophistry, or otherwise, to upset these principles, though he may be an excellent man, has no right within a party whose raison d'être is the realisation of an ideal based on the assumed truth of these principles. The cackle of toleration, of 'self-criticism,' and what-not, is the veriest balderdash. We want no 'self-criticism' within the party in the matter of fundamentals. We have a right to assume that a man has done his 'criticism' of principles before joining the party, for no party can afford to have persons within its ranks who call in question its very bases. And hence I say the moment a member begins publicly to whittle away doctrines at the foundation of the very existence of the party, he should be expelled."

Bax then goes on to distinguish between the party programme and fundamentals:

"When Askew asks me whether I think it advisable to allow members the right of free criticism of the party programme, I say Yes. But if by party programme he means the ultimate foundation on which the party rests the basal object for which the party is constituted, I say No.

No man has a right to expect to be allowed to remain a member of a party whose principles, whether rightly or wrongly, he has publicly called in question. On the other hand, no party has a right to use the State, the secular arm, to crush opposition to its views.

The utmost that has been suggested is that he [Bernstein] should be politely, but firmly, told to clear out of the German Social Democratic organisation, and take his criticism with him. There is nothing to prevent him from demolishing Marx or anybody else outside the organisation. What more than this can he want?"

The rest of Bax's reply consists of some sarcastic references to Askew's contribution, some instances of Bernstein's perfidious conduct, and a misunderstanding of Askew's reference to views held by Bax which, he alleged, put Bax in the position he claimed Bernstein was in. Bax took this to mean his attitude to feminism, whereas it

really referred to his attitude to the Materialist Conception of History. Bax held views at variance with the Materialist Conception of History, and had debated his view with Kautsky in the German party Journal a few years earlier. He called his view "The Synthetic Doc-

trine of History." We will discuss his outlook at the end of the controversy over Bernstein's membership of the German Social Democratic Party.

GILMAC.

(To be continued.)

LORD AMWELL AND THE LABOUR PARTY

Pointed Criticism by Early Member of the S.D.F.

WITH the permission of the *Daily Mail* and Lord Amwell we reproduce below the article "Why I Quit the Labour Party," published in the *Mail* on 16 December, 1955. It is of more than passing interest because Frederick Montague, besides having been Labour M.P. and having held office in Labour Government, was a member of the Social Democratic Federation at the time members broke away to form the S.P.G.B. in 1904. He had joined the S.D.F. in 1894 and the I.L.P. in 1895 (dual membership being quite an accepted thing at that time) and later became a member of the Labour Party. The

S.D.F. which, after some changes of name, had reverted to its earlier name, lost membership and influence and disappeared early in the second world war. In 1939, the last year in which it appeared among the organizations affiliated to the Labour Party (with a membership reduced to 500) Fred Montague was their delegate at the Labour Party Conference.

All this gives interest to Lord Amwell's reason for leaving the party that he has supported for so long. Many of the points he makes are in line with S.P.G.B. arguments

ED. COMM.

WHY I QUIT THE LABOUR PARTY

One-time newsboy and shop assistant, Lord Amwell, Frederick Montague as he then was, sat as Labour M.P. for West Islington from 1923 to 1931 and from 1935 to 1947. He was Under-Secretary of State for Air, 1929-31; Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport, 1940-41; and Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Aircraft Production, 1941-42. He was created Baron in 1947.

I quit, but not to cross any floor, only to be free. I want freedom to say without embarrassment that which I feel ought to be said about today's labour politics and industrial tactics.

Clement Attlee's departure provides the occasion by loosening certain ties of personal loyalty.

Labour was never very clear in its Socialist theory but I, for one, hoped for the best. Today's attempt at "refashioning Socialism as a philosophy and finding practical programmes to meet the needs of the times" has resulted in grounding the principles by which the movement was originally inspired. Such is my view and here are some of my reasons for holding it.

"Welfare" has nothing whatever to do with Socialism, and constitutes no "silent revolution." It did not originate with the Labour Party and was not opposed by any party. It is not a party issue. That "rascally" Tories voted against the Welfare State is not true. Naturally Tories wanted their own way on details, but they no more voted against the principle than Labour voted against having an Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mislead

It is a little disgusting to mislead electors by taking advantage of popular ignorance of Parliamentary procedure in the interest of vote-catching.

I have no objection to "Welfare." We live in a keen Capitalist world that must be allowed to work or we starve. But I do object to the substitution of it for what we are supposed to stand for and the consequent neglect of more fundamental things. Especially do I object to calling the Beveridge system Socialist and claiming fundamental change for it, silent or not.

It is not true that "poverty has been wiped out in

Britain for ever," as Attlee told the Russians. The authoritative figure of persons in receipt of public assistance is 1,600,000. These are not all old persons:

Substitute

The fact is that "Welfare" implies the continued existence of the inherited and the disinherited—Disraeli's "Two Nations." It is made a substitute for Socialism on the ground that it involves a redistribution of national income—the alleged silent revolution. But Socialism is not the redistribution of money income. It is production for use and the distribution of that.

There is now full employment upon the basis of inflation, which is quite another matter. For how long? Three-and-a-half-million married women go out to work. They will not go out to work when inflation has run its course and lower prices set in. The production line at any old wage will last as long as markets are kept and no longer.

The American motor-car balloon is already sagging. Automation and "atomation" may soon start its own silent revolution. For leisure? Oh, certainly for leisure if we don't look out! How are you going to sell superabundance to countries also superabundant?

The Illusion

In my view it is a complete illusion that high-powered industry on a vast scale can be "taken over" as a going concern, or "planned" from the outside, without taking over and planning human beings. Stateism which under trades union rule means syndicalism was never the dream of old. Mechanism and freedom won't mix.

Labour in face of tremendous problems seems to me to be playing the old unclean party game, peddling for votes on the "Ninepence for fourpence" and "Big loaf instead of little loaf" pattern. I have no use for it. I think the propaganda of Transport House shocking in its mendacity and its appeal to cupidity. Not thus was a loveable movement made.

Labour's new generation even experts like Gaitskill himself, brilliant player of the "game" as he no doubt will be, no more understand the economics of Capitalism than they do the economics of Socialism.

We are not informed as to what has happened to the untold millions made overnight on the floor of the London Stock Exchange. Silence reigns on this matter, because the untold millions are no longer told. In this notion that ledger-entries and real wealth are one and the same thing and that "there's plenty where that came from" to go on being distributed there is the elementary fallacy that Socialists laughed out of court years ago. The fallacy of "sharing out."

Can't be done

I want to say these things and much more. I want

to show how it is that Socialism cannot be properly dressed in Capitalist togs, that "welfare" is precariously poised, as Beveridge admits, and that a free economy is possible.

I want also to show that social reform in history has always been a process of "tidying up" when the cruder forms of exploitation have ceased to pay. There is no exception to this, and it makes a big difference once understood, to what we think about fundamentals and expediences.

So, I quit!

THE PASSING SHOW

Public Recantation

The New Year message which Sir John Harding, Governor of Cyprus, delivered to the grateful subjects of British rule in that colony has not had the publicity it deserves. Sir John Harding reached the rank of Field-Marshal in the British Army, and took a prominent part in the second world war on the Anglo-Russian-American side. As such he gave his support and blessing to the measures undertaken by Britain and its allies in that war, including the mass-bombing of German towns, and the murder of unarmed German men, women and children which that bombing entailed. When *The Times* (2.1.56), therefore, reports that Sir John has said to the Cypriots "acts of violence only made the achievement of a peaceful settlement all the more difficult," one is bound to pay close attention. And when that newspaper says that the message continued:

"Shooting unarmed men in the back and indiscriminate tossing of bombs in public places were acts of brutality debasing both those who committed them and those who connived at them."

—it becomes clear that Sir John has had a change of heart. The importance of this cannot be over-estimated. Sir John knows what he is talking about. He knows exactly what it is to "connive at" the "indiscriminate tossing of bombs in public places": he was doing it all through the last war. And if Sir John, with all his long experience and expert knowledge, has decided that these "acts of brutality" debase "both those who committed them and those who connived at them," who are we to contradict him?

God made them high and lowly . . .

The recent death of Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, deprived him of a barony, which it had been intended to bestow on him in the New Year's Honours List. At first it was considered that this would have been an honour for Dr. Garbett: a step up in the social scale. But then came second thoughts. Surely, it was asked, Dr. Garbett, as Archbishop of York, already had precedence over even dukes, the highest-ranking laymen outside the Royal Family?

. . . And ordered their estate

Theoretically it is true that an Archbishop has precedence over a duke. But this grading dates from former days. In an age when the mass of people still believed in Christianity, still believed in religious dogmas and punishments in the after world, it followed that the Church was a highly valuable branch of the State. And the Princes of the Church were rewarded accordingly. A hundred

years ago the income of a bishop compared very favourably with that of the greatest landowners, or merchant princes, or entrepreneurs. But with the growth of irreligion in the modern world, the majority of people in this country now have either no religious beliefs at all or none of any importance. Accordingly, the use of the Church to the State has much diminished; and the real income of bishops, while still appearing very large to the ordinary



worker, has never been so low. As for the rank-and-file of ministers of religion, some of the worst-paid now receive no more than many workers. And while the clergy as a body make no protest about the low standards of the working class, they object strongly to having to live on the same standards themselves. The clergy, of course, believe theoretically in apostolic poverty, but they have always kept their preaching and their practice in strictly separate compartments. And now that they are, in this respect at any rate, compelled to practise what they preach, their complaints fill the Press. Nothing is more melancholy than to see people who are compelled to do themselves what they have always urged on others.

See the conquering hero

The remedy of the clergy, however, lies in their own hands. If a parson can so far go against the current of the times as to become a great popular success, with full and enthusiastic churches, then the ruling class will realize his value and will see to it that he is well rewarded. Religion is not yet at such a discount in the United States as it is here; and it is from America that Billy Graham has made his sallies across the Atlantic. Dr. Graham commands more real income than two or three English bishops: and members of the British ruling class hurried to give him financial backing in his tours of this country—among them Mr. Alfred Owen, the racing-motor magnate, and Major-General Sir Edward Spears, the Chairman of the Council of the Institute of Directors, and a director of five companies. Lawyers, politicians, army officers, all hurry to Graham's side, and the Prime Minister receives him at No. 10, Downing Street.

Count me in

The significance of Dr. Graham's success is not lost on English church leaders. Though his antiquated theological views are so discredited and exploded that anyone holding them would be turned out of any self-respecting theological college, leaders of the Anglican and Nonconformist Churches rush to climb on his bandwagon. Prominent Methodists like the Rev. E. Benson Perkins, and Anglican prelates like the Bishop of Barking, would three years ago have sooner joined the Rational Press Association than had any truck with anyone holding Dr. Graham's fundamentalist views. But nothing succeeds like success, and a man who gets as many thousand dollars a year as Billy Graham does merely for preaching must obviously be on to a good thing. So on to Dr. Graham's platform troop Benson Perkins and Dr. Gough of Barking: in the fabulous company of the Graham gospel-singers and cheer-leaders the reverend gentlemen find that they can swallow not only Jonah but also his whale.

The church leaders who support Dr. Graham are, from their own point of view, on the right lines. For it is

only by filling the churches again that the leaders of organized religion can win back their former high place in society.

Gracious permission

"The Pope declared today that the Roman Catholic Church had no moral or theological objections to a Russian means of achieving painless childbirth claimed to be 85 or 90 per cent. successful."

From the *Daily Herald*, 9.1.56.

Which is very kind of him. But it says much of the supposedly humanitarian Christian church when the leader of a large section of it has to take the trouble to announce this publicly. And the grounds given by the Pope are not, as one would have thought, humanitarian at all.

"If pain and fear are successfully eliminated from childbirth," the Pope said, "that very fact frequently diminishes an inducement to commit immoral acts in the use of marriage rights."

In other words the new method is all right because it may make women less likely to use any form of contraception, and thus more likely to obey the Catholic Church's teaching against such devices. It makes one wonder what the Pope's decision would have been if the new method had not served any Catholic end.

Adulation corner

What did you think about 1955? Was there a little more distinction, a little more gaiety, which you couldn't account for?

The *Sunday Express* has revealed all. The reason was—Princess Alexandra. It prints her picture (25.12.55) with the caption "Here is the official birthday portrait of the Princess who, in her first full year 'out,' has added distinction and gaiety to society."

No doubt "society" is grateful. So ought we all to be. And anyone who remarks that the royal princesses ought to make some return for the fat living they get runs a grave risk of not being invited to Royal Ascot this year.

ALWYN EDGAR.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND SOCIALISM

IN reply to Frank Maitland, a prominent member of the Independent Labour Party, writing in their paper *The Socialist Leader* (19/11/55), Gladys Bing, an advocate of Social Credit, makes a number of incorrect assertions on the nature of Socialism. Unfortunately, Mr. Maitland in his letter does not help either, as he envisages the existence of credit in a Socialist society. Being an admirer of Lenin and Trotsky this is not surprising.

In her letter Gladys Bing writes:—

"Social Credit rejects entirely the idea that a political party shall control the credit of the people. On the contrary, it asserts that no political party shall impose 'five year plans'; or shall dole out 'to each according to his need' plus his P.A.Y.E., or demand 'from each according to his ability' . . ."

Within a Socialist society no political party will control credit; in fact a credit system will be unnecessary—and political parties, including the Socialist Party, will be things of the past.

Socialism will not impose "five year plans," dole out "to each according to his needs," or demand "from each according to his ability." In fact, Socialism will impose nothing. People will *freely* contribute to society, according to their varying abilities, and will take, again *quite freely*, according to their needs and wants. In such a society barter, or a means of exchange—i.e. money—will have become redundant.

Reforming or tinkering about with the credit or present monetary system, as advocated by Social Creditors and others, will not solve the problems or contradictions of Capitalism.

PETER E. NEWELL.

Correction

In the last paragraph of the Editorial in the January issue (The Faking of Reports by the Beaverbrook Press) the date of the *Evening Standard* should have been given as 12 October, 1955, not 1945.

ED. COMM.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

FEBRUARY



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

WHERE ARE THE TRADE UNIONS GOING?

WHAT is the state of the Unions? The answer is a paradoxical one. The trade unions are outwardly flourishing, but trade unionists have never before been so apathetic and lacking in a feeling of making worth while progress. Membership is at a record level even though it covers much less than half the workers. Funds are higher than at any time. Administratively the Unions are more efficient and in detailed operations more active. Strikes have become more frequent and new agreements are constantly being negotiated. Arbitration tribunals are at work all the time and trade union journals are full of claims of wage demands brought to a more or less successful conclusion. As far as trade union law is concerned the position, since the repeal in 1946 of the 1927 Trade Disputes Act, is in the eyes of the unions fairly satisfactory. Trade Union officials are consulted by governments, Tory as well as Labour, more than they have ever been. Trade Union officials more frequently get into honours lists and are appointed to the boards of nationalised industrial and to other public bodies. Unemployment is low and jobs are easy to get. On the face of it the trade unions are in a better position than they ever hoped to be, yet most of their members are dissatisfied and with little hope that their movement is getting anywhere. In practically all unions the same features appear of sparsely attended branch meetings, very small votes at election ballots for officials and delegates, accompanied by widespread cynicism and discontent about the decisions taken in their

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD February, 1956

name. Most of the members would like to see big changes in the world, as is shown by the thousands of resolutions they allow to go forward in their name demanding a higher standard of living, shorter hours, better working conditions, and, in the wider sphere, world peace, abolition of conscription, world disarmament and the cultivation of friendly relations with workers in other countries.

The explanation of this paradoxical situation is not difficult to find; it is that the great activity of the unions mostly produces no real gain at all. The well-meant resolutions seeking a better world have no effect. Hopes placed in Labour Government have been disappointed. Wage claims, strikes and arbitration awards for the most part merely mean the tardy adjustment to rising prices. For every industry that has been able to get ahead of the cost of living there is another that has fallen behind and earnings have to be made up by exhausting piece-work, overtime and shift work. Nationalisation has proved to be a disillusionment and the workers elevated to the boards of nationalised industries have carried on without change the normal functions and attitudes of private employers. Inside the unions, despite the progress of amalgamation into bigger organisations, the greater influence of the Trades Union Congress, and the development of international trade union contacts and groupings sectional interests and jealousies are still powerful and in the international field workers still in the main face each other as rival national groups.

Some observers see hope in the seemingly more progressive attitude of unions that they would describe as the more militant ones but this, too, is largely illusory. Certainly it is in the interest of the workers in a time of booming trade to make the most of their opportunities but it remains true that trade unionists as a whole are not going anywhere, they are all of them trying to work out their salvation within the framework of Capitalism. Their conception of their entitlement is to demand that wages keep up with the cost of living, or that wages should be increased a little more at the expense of profits. This pathetic acceptance of struggle with the Capitalist system instead of political struggle for the abolition of Capitalism and with it for the ending of the wages system, profit-making and property increases, and production for sale, can be illustrated from the "Militant" Electrical Trades Union. That body, with its allegedly Communist leadership, still agitates for nationalisation as if that would solve the workers problems; and its journal "Electron" (October, 1955) showed pictorially how limited is the outlook of its membership with a cover design in which a worker holds aloft a banner with strange device "The Right to Strike. The Right to Picket. Inviolability of Union Funds." These were the "bold" aspirations of 1856, grown to accepted respectability 50 years ago.

The fact is of course that the great majority of workers inside and outside of the unions, despite their vague aspirations for better things, do not yet understand the imperative need for the abolition of Capitalism and establishment of Socialism. It is a sobering spectacle, but not a cause for despair. Progress has been made and with it the promise of the spread of Socialist ideas. The workers of 1956 have had the experience of nationalisation, Labour Governments, the so-called Welfare State and multitudinous social reforms. They have learned, or are learning, the emptiness of the things they once passionately believed in. This is the rich field for Socialists and Socialist propaganda to work in.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD February, 1956

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," February, 1906)

The Class Struggle

Great stress is laid on the dictum that Communism is not a mere party doctrine of the working class but a theory compassing the emancipation of society at large, including the Capitalist class from its present narrow conditions. This is true enough in the abstract, but absolutely useless, and sometimes worse, in practice. So long as the wealthy classes not only do not feel the want of any emancipation, but strenuously oppose the self-emancipation of the working-class, so long the social revolution will have to be prepared and fought out by the working-class alone.

The French Bourgeois of 1789, too, declared the emancipation of the bourgeoisie to be the emancipation of the whole human race; but the nobility and clergy would

not see it; the proposition—though for the time being, with respect to feudalism, an abstract historical truth—soon became a mere sentimentalism, and disappeared from view altogether in the fire of the revolutionary struggle. And today, the very people who, from the "impartiality" of their superior standpoint, preach to the workers a Socialism soaring high above their class interests and class struggles, and tending to reconcile in a higher humanity the interests of both the contending classes—these people are either neophytes, who have still to learn a great deal, or they are the worst enemies of the workers—wolves in sheep's clothing.

(Frederick Engels, 1892. Preface to "Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844." Page X.)

"THE ILLUSION OF AN EPOCH"

H. B. Acton—Cohen and Webb

PART II

LENIN instead of taking a consistent Marxist view in his disputes with Mach and his errant Bolsheviks got himself involved in metaphysical definitions of "matter," "energy," "space," "time" etc., and his "naive realism" and "common sense" defence of Materialism was largely a recapitulation of the ideas of a bygone age. His dogmatic assertions as to the eternal nature of matter and his equally dogmatic assertions of the priority of matter over mind are no part of Marxism but belong to traditional philosophical thought. What Marxists have to do is to explain philosophical notions as themselves being historical products.

Lenin instead of keeping to the Marxist viewpoint of the sciences being explained from the standpoint of an historically conditioned activity seemed to think that the systemised truth finding character of the sciences supplied data for Marxist Materialism. In actual fact the special disciplines of the sciences cannot be deduced from Marxism nor Marxism from them. One cannot of course transfer willy nilly the truths of a particular field of knowledge to all other fields without these particular truths losing their relevance and identity. Thus the physicists' concept of matter is not bound up with the assumptions of Marxism. The behaviour of matter in the sub-atomic universe is a local and microscopic affair and irrelevant in any significant sense to the microscopic levels of social development. Reality for Marxists is not bound up with attempts to discover or explain the ultimate character of the physical world. Reality for them consists of the historical development of men's own social life.

Lenin believed, however, that Marxism had a right to dispense authority to everything under the sun. That is why he substituted for Historical Materialism the term Dialectical Materialism. He was thus instrumental in changing a revolutionary and empirical theory of social life into an authoritarian doctrine which formed the conceptual framework of a state philosophy different in degree but not in kind to other state philosophies, i.e., German and Italian Fascism and U.S.A. "Democracy." Such was the tragic fulfillment of this Russian "Marxism."

To Lenin's 18th Century Materialism and Feuerbachism there was embroidered the Hegelian categories of "negation of the negation," "thesis and antithesis,"

"quality and quantity," etc. This gave Leninism a novel and revolutionary appearance and it still continues to successfully masquerade as Marxism. It has deceived countless University dons and ideologues including Professor Acton, himself a Professor of Philosophy. In the 30's the Marx, Engels, Lenin Institute published attractively got up editions of Dialectical Materialism which won over a few of the literary intelligentsia to a philosophy which would prove wrong to be right, foul to be fair, night to be day. Most of them have left with burning indignation at the gross deception carried out on them. Against the strongholds of Capitalist learning Leninism made little or no impression. Academic Philosophy which has smarted under the slings and arrows of outrageous "Communism" have launched an ideological counter attack against Leninism (called by them, Marxism). Nevertheless, Lenin has been faithfully supported by his minor followers and one has only to observe the shifts of Cornforth, John Lewis, Emile Burns and others in that cultured periodical "The Modern Quarterly" in their defence of Leninist metaphysics.

It might be asked at this stage, where does Professor Acton come in? Really he doesn't. What his book "The Illusion of an Epoch" does illustrate is the Communist genius for deceiving friend and foe alike. His own treatment of Leninism which he calls "the philosophical creed of Marxism" is banefully formal, lacking any real social approach in historical perspective. Even in his analysis of the 18th century Materialism of Lenin he is uncertain. On one hand he seems to think Lenin's attack on Machism was wrong, on the other hand he seems to think in some respects he was right. Nevertheless in his attempt to prove that he's got something the Professor brings in the whole choir of heaven and earth believing perhaps that with so many things some of them or one of them must be right. The Professor mixes up Marxism with everything else, Berkleyism, Humism, Kantism, even Freudism. Small wonder he himself becomes a little mixed.

Among other things he mentions is that according to Marxism, technology is the essence of man (P. 149). According to the Professor Marxists believe that present

day class society is the outcome of technical development. Marxists hold the opposite view and say that technical development is generated by the Capitalist relations of production. Marxists are careful to explain that it is the social productive relations, i.e., the way men stand to each other in the production and distribution of wealth which initiate and regulate technical processes. Indeed, as against Professor Acton the Marxists say it is not the Capitalists who are instruments of the mode of production but the mode of production which serves Capitalists' interests.

The Professor also confuses the sub-division of labour with the social relations of production (P. 161). For him a factory would constitute productive relations. Thus if a new invention were introduced the character of industrial co-operation in the factory might be modified. This, according to Professor Acton would not bring about new productive relations. The Professor fails to understand

that it has only modified the mode of production peculiar to a given set of social productive relations, and has nothing to do with changes in the productive relations themselves.

He talks of the Marxist confusion of the material foundations of society. This, he says, includes techniques, skills, tools, inventions, etc., thus he argues the material life of society consists of mental components as well. But as Marx went to great pains to point out, the material bases of society are physical resources, i.e., nature-given materials and men's physical energies. Skills and techniques are the means, the productive forces, which maintain this material existence. What one can say in conclusion is that Professor Acton knows less about the real world than is excusable even for a Professor of Philosophy.

(Concluded.)

E.W.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE AND SOCIALISM

(Correspondence continued from August, October and December issue)

Golders Green, N.W.11.

The Ed. Comm., in its reply to my letter in the December issue, claims that I have refused to deal with certain questions put to me.

(1) I am asked to give "evidence from history of a new class not needing to gain full or shared control of the machinery of government because of changing 'attitudes'." My reply is that economic classes do not form governments. The Capitalist class did not capture power in order to establish Capitalism. More to the point, Socialism does not mean a new class gaining control of the machinery of government, including its coercive forces. It describes society organised on a classless and non-coercive basis.

(2) "... he still does not say what he holds to be the cause of the change of institutions." I am also supposed to have left my position "carefully concealed," though the Ed. Comm. is acute enough to perceive that "he thinks attitudes change and the institutions of political power change with them." My reference to race prejudice was dismissed by the Ed. Comm. as showing a complete failure to understand its nature. While I agree that race prejudice is closely related to economic conflict, it remains true that accepted theory and habitual practice have a strong tendency to move together. Take the example of the attitude of white G.I.'s toward Negroes:

"Those who had no experience with Negroes in the Army voted more than 90 per cent. against being brigaded with them.

Those who had limited contact voted 67 per cent. against it.

Those who were used to Negroes in the same regiment, but not in the same company, voted 50 per cent. against it.

But white soldiers who had fought in the same company side by side with Negroes, were 86 per cent. in favour of continuing the arrangement.

(quoted by Stuart Chase in *Roads to Agreement*, p. 3).

This does seem to show that change in institutions—the way people fix their pattern of social behaviour—does not wait upon the majority to change their attitudes. If the institutions of racial segregation are seen to change into those of racial integration *despite initial attitudes hostile to the change*, it should make us wonder what

kind of political institutions there will be when most people have Socialist attitudes. The Socialist Party says that when most people have Socialist attitudes they will start to change the institutions of Capitalism (by capturing control of the machinery of government, etc.). My point is that these institutions will already have changed, making the plans based upon *no change* sound as ludicrous as "To the barricades!" sounds today.

(3) What is actually happening to the State in present society? It is generally agreed that there has been a tendency for its economic functions to increase, and this is expressed in the term "Welfare State." The Socialist Party's case is that the Socialist working class must capture political power and fashion the State in accordance with its own interests. This involves replacing government of persons by administration of things. But this latter process has already started. The administration of the State is no longer exclusively in the hands of a hereditary caste. Members of all classes are being brought in, at every level, in accordance with their ability to do the job. The democratic movement which achieved partial and then universal suffrage has not stopped—it is now gaining for workers more say in setting the conditions of their work. I do not doubt that the present state of affairs leaves a lot to be desired—as when working class leaders get drawn into the more Capitalist functions of the State. The point is that "administration of things" is not something that starts only after the revolution. It must already have been growing in the womb of the old society.

To sum up my position, I share with the Socialist Party a keen interest in the growth of Socialist conditions. I think that this growth occurs in attitudes and institutions together, because a study of how society actually functions compels me to take that view. Socialism is a quality of society that emerges from thinking and acting in terms of humanity, not of antagonistic classes. It therefore means using *Socialist* methods of resolving conflicts, and not seeking to use the coercive powers of class-divided society.

Yours sincerely,

S. R. PARKER.

REPLY

Our critic has all along maintained that the achievement of Socialism does not require gaining control of the political machinery. He rejects political action and offers instead the conception of "attitudes" and "institutions," changing and making control of the machinery of government unnecessary. We have twice asked him for evidence from history of a new class "not needing to gain full or shared control of the machinery of government." Again he side-steps the question and offers as his reply the statement that "economic classes do not form governments. The Capitalist class did not capture power in order to establish capitalism."

It will be observed that this statement does not touch the question one way or the other and we conclude from it that our critic is unable to give an instance of a new class achieving its aims without having to acquire such political control: indeed the second part of his statement admits that the Capitalist class did capture power, and presumably therefore they at least were convinced that they could not do without it.

We also asked our critic to give current examples of "attitudes being changed and having already brought about essential changes in the Capitalist institutions of political power."

For this he offers the story from Stuart Chase's "Roads to Agreement" of white American soldiers who had fought side by side with negro soldiers, being 86 per cent. in favour of continuing contact, while those with less contact with negroes, were divided 50-50, or were strongly opposed. The implication is that "the more they are together" the more they are likely to be on a friendly footing. This can happen in a fighting unit where self preservation called for close working together, but in the civilian world of employment and of living side by side, the reverse is more likely to happen. British workers who had never set eyes on Eskimos might have the most friendly sentiments towards them, but if thousands of them came in competing for jobs ill-feeling would begin to grow. Let our critic apply his notion to the places where tension is great and growing. Does he really think that Israel, Kenya, South Africa, Cyprus, etc., support the belief that the more and the longer they mix, the friendlier and less prejudiced they become?

Socialists know that knowledge of the identity of working class interests, of the Capitalist cause of economic conflicts and of the Socialist remedy for them can

combat prejudice based on ignorance. It will, however, be noticed that our critic bases his case simply on contacts—in this case the contacts of white and negro soldiers.

But his selection of this little story itself shows how blind he is to the world of Capitalism. He offers it in support of his case that "Capitalist institutions of political power" are changing in a Socialist direction. And what does he choose? Of all things he takes his example from the armed forces of the United States at war! White and negro American soldiers had come out of the second world war, where they killed and hated Japanese and Germans, and were, at the time the book was published, killing and hating Koreans and Chinese—not to mention special hatred worked up against the Russians who were believed to be "behind the scenes." It is here that our critic fancies he finds evidence of brotherly love growing apace. He has to choose the armed forces of the greatest military, naval and air power of all time, forces costing more and with infinitely more destructive power at their command than have ever been known to the human race.

And for this he asks us to believe that institutions of political power are changing towards Socialism and that it is not and will not be necessary to gain control of the political machine!

We should not be surprised that our critic, who can see bits of Socialism inside Capitalism's war machine, can also discern "Socialist" economic changes. He sees the "Welfare State" and believes that this is "Socialist" because it means an increase of Capitalism's economic functions. For the central or local government to control or actively participate in the provision of certain services, or control prices and wages is not new and is not Socialist. It existed centuries ago and it shows at present no general trend to increase; the past five years have seen a decline. This decline might be followed by a further increase (the same ebb and flow has happened in earlier centuries) but it would still not be a progress towards Socialism.

On the one really vital function of the Capitalist State our critic is silent—the maintenance of the ownership of wealth. In spite of the superficial appearance of constant change the class ownership of the means of production and distribution, the 10 per cent. who own 90 per cent., is as it was before the "Welfare State" was heard of, his supposed trend of change towards a new and different form of society is a myth.

ED. COMM.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

Socialist Standards are regularly on sale at various news-stands in London and the Literature Circulating Committee have prepared a list which is given in this issue. Please make a note of these stands and pass the addresses on to members and sympathisers.

Debate with I.L.P. Comrade Willmott is speaking on behalf of the Party and Frank Maitland is speaking for the I.L.P. at a debate arranged to take place on Monday, 6th February, at 7 p.m., at The CENTRAL LIBRARY, SPA ROAD, BERMONDSEY. The debate is being well advertised and the hall accommodates over 500 people and we hope that members will get along and bring as many friends and sympathisers, and of course, opponents. Spa Road can be reached by a No. 1 bus from the West End or by train from London Bridge, Southern Region Station.

Central London Meeting. On Monday, 12th March, a meeting is being held at CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.7, when Comrades Bryan and Cane will speak on "Britain's Departing Empire—the Socialist attitude." As it is some time since a meeting of this size has been arranged in Central London, the Executive Committee and the Propaganda Committee are anxious that this should be a success so members are asked to advertise it as widely as possible.

Ealing Branch. The second series of Branch lectures has begun and will be held fortnightly until the end of March at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road (Near Ealing Broadway). February lectures are held at 8 p.m. on Friday 3rd and 17th of the month. Members have been written to with full details of these lectures and are asked to give them their fullest support.

Preliminary plans are being made by the Branch Literature Committee for another special May Sales drive to increase the circulation of the STANDARD. The Branch intention is to attempt to sell One Thousand copies during the month.

Nottingham. Branch propaganda is still going well. Comrade Willmott is speaking at the Co-op Hall, Parliament Street, at 7 p.m. on Sunday, 26th February. Another meeting is being arranged for March 25th. Also several members are planning a May Day trip from London on Sunday, May 6th.

ARE THE TEACHERS LEARNING?

At the time of writing the school teachers are claiming some measure of public interest over their attitude to the Government's Superannuation policy.

The general public have, of course, always known of the existence of teachers: all of them, to a greater or lesser degree have at some time come under their influence while many are hoping that their son or daughter will eventually step into the profession. Nevertheless, perhaps the vast majority of teachers are a "race apart" and when the subject of schools and schoolteachers comes up during a conversation at the "local" or at the factory it is generally held that teachers have nothing to grumble about, being well paid and having more leisure time than the average worker in industry.

Perhaps therefore we should enquire into the business of teachers and teaching more closely before coming to over hasty opinions.

The first thing we would discover would be that every form of society had its teachers; secondly, the pedagogue was invariably an important (perhaps the most important) servant of the ruling class in any given society. This is not at all difficult to realise when we follow the role of the teacher back through history. Without bothering to go abroad or even back to the pre-mediaeval times when the teacher included in his "bag of tools" such attributes as doctor, priest, musician and prophet, we can glean sufficient, merely from a study of teaching craft from the time of the Norman Conquest.

The early teachers were the monks of the church, the school buildings, the Monastic houses, the curriculum one that fitted its pupils to become wise in the affairs of State and Church and also to teach the peasantry the humility necessary for the preservation of their lords spiritually and earthly.

With the growth of trade, through colonization, the teacher was again necessary to instil sufficient skill into the heads of those who served in the business houses and later the factories which were the new forms of wealth production for the ruling class. The "Industrial Revolution" gave a boost to the spread of so-called popular, universal education. So much so that one, Robert Lowe, expressed on behalf of many of his friends, that there was a danger that they may be "educating their future masters!" This, of course, has not materialized.

Now-a-days, education is more important than ever; in a world with its science and pseudo-science, a world wherein newspapers count their copies in millions; in which bureaucracy requires the filling-in of forms and documents by the tens of millions, the worker must be provided with at least the minimum education. Educationists, of course, have not wholly agreed on the purpose and aim of education. Some claim that it should be

Films at Head Office. The Sunday evening meetings are now well established and a list of the February meetings is given in this issue. After each film a commentary is made by a Party speaker.

Fulham Branch is now meeting at 34, St. George's Square (Wilcox; top flat), S.W.1, every Thursday evening at 8 p.m. The Branch Secretary is now Com. Peter E. Newell, and all enquiries, etc., should be addressed to him c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

P.H.

vocational, others that it is the creation of the aesthetic, others that its aim is to instil a sense of citizenship and to create "harmonious development."

The teacher has to serve as ever. His job is to turn out the product required whether as hewers of wood and drawers of water or nuclear physicists. Both are vitally necessary to the profit system.

At the moment teachers, a long suffering rather servile group, are stirring. Their present living standards are threatened. They, like most others, see this as an injustice and so it is. When will they learn from history the plain fact that in serving their lords and masters as they have for centuries, *they have always been servile?* Perhaps more so, since they have been more blind than many to the true nature of their position. They have traditionally thought of themselves as being members of a mythical Middle Class; a kind of elite and have tended to weave a cocoon of academic aloofness around themselves. They are still monastic-minded. When they realise that there are just two classes in society, an owning class and a class that lives by the sale of its labour power, and that they belong to the latter, then perhaps they will draw closer to the broader working class. They may, in time, reach the stage when they will attain the education that Squire Brown spoke of—"that which is learned after you have forgotten what you learned at school." They may begin to realise that Socialism which can only come about by the joint effort of *all sections of the working class*, is the only way out of wars and crises. *Those who have so dutifully, so well, and for so long, taught others, will have educated themselves.*

W. BRAIN.

"I have no doubt," said Mons. Danyaz, "that a kilogramme of radium would be sufficient to destroy the population of Paris, granting that they came within its influence. Men and women would be killed just as easily as mice. They would feel nothing during their exposure to the radium, nor realise that they were in any danger, and weeks would pass after their exposure before anything would happen. Then gradually the skin would begin to peel off and their bodies would become one great sore. Then they would become blind. Then they would die from paralysis and congestion of the spinal cord." (Quoted by *The Morning Leader*, Monday, 11th January, 1904, in the Report from Paris of the discovery of Radium by Marie Curie from the "Strand Magazine," January, 1904.)

"We are, not technically, carnivorous ourselves. But as destroyers of life, not only the lives of other animals, but those of our own kind, we are unquestionably without a peer in the animal kingdom." ("Man and the Vertebrates," Professor Sherwood Romer (Pelican).

"MARIE CURIE"

It was a bleak morning in November, 1891, when a slight Polish girl clambered down the steps of the German coach at the Gare du Nord. In her hands was clutched her luggage, a folding chair (for the fourth class carriages on the German railways had no seats), a heavy quilt, some books, and food.

She had travelled three days from Warsaw to join her sister, who, while qualifying as a doctor, had married a member of her faculty, also a Pole.

Their mother had died when they were small, leaving the father to raise a family of four girls and a boy.

Both father and mother were teachers. The father, a teacher of physics and mathematics out of favour with the Tsarist inspectors, found his family a problem.

Poland was under the Tsar, no higher education, or professional status, was open to women. After several disappointing years in various posts as "governess" to wealthy families, the girl, Marya, surname Sklodowsky, counted up every farthing of her pitiful savings for the great adventure.

She had left the Girls' High School in Warsaw with the highest marks obtainable, and a remarkable knowledge of four foreign languages.

Now, at last, after years of scraping, she was in Paris, bringing her blankets, a mattress, towels and sheets, which her practical sister, Bronya, had said would save precious francs. Her goal, the legendary Sorbonne, now, as then, the largest University in the world.

France, despite the setbacks of 1848 and the Commune, was still the most democratic country in Europe. Fees at the University were not high and no discrimination was made against applicants of foreign birth, off-white colour, or lowly origin; which a certain Creole, by name Paul Lafargue, had appreciated some years previously.

Marya immediately plunged into a life of fanatical study, her star, the Master's degree in Physical Science. Lodging with her married sister, at first, she subsequently rented a tiny sixth-floor attic in the Latin Quarter to save time and bus fares. Food and warmth were secondary—so limited were her means (partly a small sum contributed by her ageing father), that she regularly frequented the public library till closing time to save a penny on lamp oil.

If her brother-in-law had not found her and not been a doctor of medicine, radium might be unknown to this day, for she was unconscious in her garret from starvation, cold and fatigue.

A few beefsteaks in the country soon fixed that, with the result that for the first time a girl was *top* in the master's degree examinations in Physics in 1893.

This triumph was repeated in 1894 when she was first in Physics—and second in Maths. Her outstanding success secured her modest employment in research, as assistant and later as full-fledged research scientist to the Society for the Encouragement of National Industry. More than this, upon return to Poland to see her father—even the officials in Warsaw had at least sense enough to realise that here, they were onto something, and granted her a bursary for a further year's study at the Sorbonne. Back she went, with nothing less than the Doctor's degree as her aim.

For this, an original discovery is required. Characteristically, Marya selected as the subject of her doctor's theses, just about the most difficult job there was. She decided to investigate the source of Henri Becqueret's mysterious rays. This French physicist had been working on the strange

emanations from uranium salts which he had discovered.

For her research into the magnetism of steel she required some rather heavy equipment. A Polish Professor of Physics, visiting Paris, Joseph Kowalski, offered to speak to the chief of the laboratory of the School of Physics and Chemistry, on her behalf. The name of this unique young scientist was Pierre Curie. He was a Bachelor of Science at 16, a Master of Physics at 18. His father practised medicine for a livelihood though his bent was research.

A staunch '48er, Papa was a freethinking radical of the old brigade. To make quite certain that his brilliant son had a real education, he took care to see that he did not go to any school. He taught the boy himself and afterwards secured him a gifted tutor.

The result of the introduction of Marya to Pierre Curie was marriage.

Shortly before his marriage Pierre published the results of his research into crystalline physics, which won him a brilliant Doctor's degree. During this time the sole income of the pair was his salary of 500 francs per month.

Until Marya passed first in the examinations and for a Fellowship in secondary education, it was impossible for her to teach in France. Meantime, in September, 1897, Marya gave birth to her first daughter Irene, destined to become a famous physicist, and marry her mother's most able pupil, Frederic Joliot.

Marya decided to study the ionisation power of uranium—that is, to test it on an electroscope, an instrument showing a charge by raising a piece of gold-leaf. In a few weeks she was on to the idea that the radiations of uranium were an atomic property of the material itself.

The problem of whether any other substances possessed these powers next arose.

Her job now was to test every known chemical body. Soon another material, the element thorium, was found to emit radiation. Madame Curie suggested that this peculiar property be called "radio-activity." Continuing along the path she had set, the young scientist proceeded to examine every specimen of mineral known to contain uranium, or thorium, for activity. To her astonishment, certain substances quite deficient in either of these elements proved more radio-active than either of them.

To this there could only be one answer. She had examined all the known elements, therefore the powerful radio-activity must come from an unknown—a new element. An element is a substance consisting entirely of atoms of the same atomic number.

There now began one of the most astounding quests in all the remarkable history of scientific discovery. The proportion of the active stuff was minute—it was like looking for a needle in a haystack as big as a mountain—one gramme to one ton, or about one in *one million*.

The strongest rays of all had been given by the mineral pitch-blend, a greyish by-product of the glass making industry of Bohemia. The first ton was obtained, and the job that was to take four years began. The material had to be heated, evaporated and allowed to crystallise, like sugar, and the crystals tested. Twelve months after commencing her research the following communication was published in the *Proceedings* of the Academy of Science.

"The various reasons we have just enumerated lead us to believe that the new radio-active substance contains a new element to which we propose to give the name of

Radium. . . . The radio-activity of Radium must be enormous."

As is usual, this announcement met with sceptical indifference. Polonium and radium had to be "shown" to the scientists before they would believe it.

To find a place to do the job was the first problem. They were loaned the use of a shed at the Institute of Physics.

To get the stuff was the second. By a lucky break, the Austrian Government decided to present a ton of pitch-blend free, as a sample, though carriage had to be paid. To live while working was the third. Pierre had to go on teaching. Not only this, but at a critical stage in her research work, Marie had to turn out too.

She accepted a post as lecturer in physics at the Higher Normal School for Girls at Sevres, near Versailles, a Teachers' Training College.

This meant hours of setting lessons, preparing experiments, and correcting "homework," while the greatest discovery of all time was postponed. During all this time the Curie's most urgent needs, a decent laboratory in which to work, was denied them. Despite all the efforts of his friends neither the University nor the Academy of Science would make him any appointment carrying adequate laboratory facilities. At last, Paul Appell (head of the physics faculty) made a further attempt by means of a manoeuvre, namely, by nominating Pierre for award of the Legion of Honour.

Here is Pierre's reply:—

"Please be so kind as to thank the Minister and to inform him that I do not feel the slightest need of being decorated, but that I am in the greatest need of a laboratory."

Some three years later Pierre and Marie were invited

"WE'RE NOT PAUPERS! OF COURSE"

"In her suite at a West End hotel, 17-year-old raven-haired Virginia Cohen chatted with me about plans for her marriage to 22-year-old Jonathan Sieff, an heir to the Marks and Spencer chain store empire. She is the daughter of Mr. Leonard Cohen, well known in international metal broking and financial circles, who lives in Geneva. 'Jonathan and I will be married in London during the Summer but we haven't fixed the date yet,' she told me. 'We are going to live in London—Jonathan will be starting with the firm when he comes down from Oxford in 18 months' time. We are very very happy.'"

Jonathan Sieff is studying politics, philosophy and economics. Though his great-uncle, Sir Simon Marks, is chairman of the firm and his father, Mr. Michael Sieff, is a director, he will begin work as a store-hand. He first met Virginia when she was still at school. Class-mates called her "La Lollo" because they thought she looked like the Italian film star. And now one last word from Mrs. Daphne Sieff, mother of the bridegroom-to-be: "Please don't call us millionaires. It is impossible with taxation what it is, though we're not paupers, of course."

(*News of the World*, 15th January, 1956).

How silly of the SOCIALIST STANDARD to publish articles showing that there are still two classes in society.

Don't they know that Butler is taxing the rich out of existence?

With all this taxation about we cannot understand why Mr. Michael Sieff and Sir Simon Marks keep on with it.

Surely they'd be better off if they gave it all away.

to the Royal Scientific Institution in London to receive the Davy Gold Medal. Upon their return to Paris Pierre gave it to the children to play with.

Marie, at one of the brilliant functions organised after the discovery of Radium, was asked by the wife of the President of the Republic of France, "Would you like to meet his Excellency the King of Greece?"

"I don't see the utility!" was her reply.

It was inevitable that under the severe strains of earning a living by teaching science, bringing up two daughters, and devoting every available minute left to the completion of the task of isolating a grain of radium, the health of both Pierre and Marie would break down. By 1903 Pierre was suffering violent attacks of frightful pain periodically. In the same year Marie endured a miscarriage due, as she herself admitted, to "general fatigue."

In her work to obtain salts of pure radium Marie was, in the words of her daughter-biographer Eve, "a factory all by herself."

Eve Curie's book "Marie Curie," is a MUST for every Socialist.

"We had no money, no laboratory, and no help," she wrote. And yet it was in this miserable old shed that the best and happiest years of our life were spent. . . . I sometimes passed the whole day stirring a boiling mass with an iron rod nearly as big as myself. In the evening I was broken with fatigue."

Forty-five months after the day in which they had forecast the probable existence of Radium, Marie announced its atomic weight, 225. Nineteenth Century Science was knocked out. A new chapter in its chequered history had begun.

HORATIO.

(To be continued.)

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENT

S. HARRIS (Woolwich).

We have your letter criticising a statement in the article "Freedom" (January issue). You appear to have missed the point of the statement to which you refer. The article dealt with the economic compulsion which makes the worker work for an employer. It went on to say that we are free to starve "if we refuse to work for an employer." In your letter you do not mention this but write as if the point at issue is that "we can't get a job." If the writer had meant this your points about unemployment pay, etc., would be relevant; but this was not his point.

ED. COMM.

DEBATE

at

CENTRAL LIBRARY HALL,

SPA ROAD, BERMONDSEY, S.E.

on

6th FEBRUARY at 7.30 p.m. (Sharp)

INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

Represented by F. MAITLAND

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

Represented by E. WILLMOTT

Chairman: J. THOMAS

WHICH PARTY FOR SOCIALISM?

I.L.P. or S.P.G.B.

ALL WELCOME.

No. 1 bus from town to end of Spa Road,
or S. Rly. from London

NOTTINGHAM BRANCH LECTURE

at

CO-OP HALL, PARLIAMENT STREET, NOTTINGHAM

at 7 p.m.

Sunday 26th February: "Automation in Industry and
the Worker" — E. WILLMOTT.

TO READERS WHO HAVE DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING THE S.S.

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form below.

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
(6 months, 2/9) for which 5/6 is enclosed.

Name

(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

ADDRESSES OF COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA, P.O. Box
1440, Melbourne, Australia.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, P.O. Box
115, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND, P.O.
Box 133, G.P.O., Dublin, Eire.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND, P.O.
Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED
STATES, Room 307, 3000 Grand River, Detroit 1,
Michigan, U.S.A.

The SOCIALIST STANDARD, WESTERN SOCIALIST and
other Socialist literature can be obtained from the above.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bonnie Road Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 1st, 15th and 29th Feb., 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MAI 5165.

RUGBY—Group meets alternate Mondays 13th and 27th Feb., at 7, Paradise Street. Correspondence: Sec. c/o above address.

A programme of
DOCUMENTARY FILMS

will be shown at

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET

Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.

(Between Clapham North and Clapham Common
Tube Stations)

Feb. 5th "Children of the Ruins"—C. WILSON.

" 12th "Song of Ceylon"—R. COSTER.

" 19th "Land of Ulster"—J. REID.

" 26th "The Magic Touch"—C. KILNER.

How the magic touch of science is turning raw materials of all kinds, including even the most unlikely ones, into new resources for industrial and domestic use. From unpromising soil, from water, from fire, and from other common substances—even from seaweed—the scientist is producing goods and services.

Mar. 4th "People with a Purpose"—I. F. FLOWER.

○ A film about Co-operative Societies.

" 11th "Children of the City"—J. TROTMAN.

A study of juvenile delinquency.

" 18th "Local Government"—E. WILMOT.

A history in pictures.

" 25th "Atoms at Work"—BRADLEY.

Refreshments available after Meeting.

GROUPS

Will anybody interested in forming a Group or desiring any other information about Groups, apply to Group Secretary, at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (2nd and 16th Feb.)

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, Vera Barrett, 26, Harbour Crescent, Wibsey, Bradford or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

CROYDON. Enquiries to Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 13th and 27th Feb., at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.8.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to A. D. Oliver, 13, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (1st, 15th and 29th February) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. Secretary: 54, Ashdale House, Seven Sisters Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

LEYTON Branch meets Mondays 8.0 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10. Lectures and Discussions held 2nd and 4th Monday in each month. Secretary, D. Russell, c/o H.O., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 14th and 28th Feb., George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Walkden, Worsley, Near Manchester.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road, Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

ISLINGTON BRANCH LECTURE

"SOCIALISM & TRADE UNIONISM"

H. BALDWIN

Thursday, 23rd February at 8 p.m.

CO-OP HALL,

129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 619 Vol. 52 March, 1956

Are You Satisfied with Your Pay?

PLANLESS BOOMS AND RANAWAY SLUMPS

CHILDREN'S STREET GAMES

PROFESSOR COLE RIDES AGAIN

HOW TO LIVE ON YOUR £100 A WEEK

MARXISM AND INEVITABILITY

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

4^D

ASK ANY BODY OF WORKERS if they think they are getting enough pay, the pay they think they are worth, and it is safe to say that nine out of every ten would answer No! They nearly all think they ought to get more, and would get more if things were run properly. They nearly all have a vague feeling that things aren't run properly. They are annoyed that nobody—this includes the trade unions, the employers, the political parties and the Government—does anything about it and they all have some notion about what ought to be done. Some point to the impossibility of keeping themselves and their families “decently” in face of the cost of living—in their view it ought to be the duty of the employers or the Government to see that everybody has enough to maintain this “decent” standard of living.

Some think that things would be all right if wages were raised and their employers' profits lowered. But if they happen to work in a firm or an industry where sales are falling and profits are small or non-existent they look to the Government to give subsidies or do something to improve the sales of the article they produce. Lots of workers blame or envy other workers. The labourers envy the craftsmen, while the craftsmen and foremen complain that they do not receive wages sufficiently above the labourer's rate to compensate for their skill and responsibility. Many teachers have a special resentment because, as they allege, they receive no more than do dustmen. University graduates think that a proper wages policy would recognise more the importance of having a degree, and scientific workers think that the scales are unjustly weighted in favour of administrative workers. Feminists clamour for the male “rate for the job” and provoke some of their male colleagues into demanding “justice” for the married man with dependents. The queue of the disgruntled stretches indefinitely and encircles the globe.

They are all there, the bank clerks and postal clerks, the parsons, the lawyers, the doctors, the dentists and nurses. The shopkeepers, too, have their grievances against the manufacturers and are looking with envy now at the furore created in France by the shopkeepers' dingy saint M. Poujade. Then there are the pensioners, the police the soldiers, the prison warders—and the Red Dean's revolting choristers at Canterbury. At the end of the line are the non-workers the small unhappy band of surtax payers and millionaires who swear that high taxation compels them, if they are to live the lives of conspicuous wastefulness fitting to their station, to overspend their incomes and eat up their capital; a practice as loathsome to a Capitalist as is cannibalism to a missionary.

And for every group of complainants there is an aspiring trade union official, politician, or economist with a glib solution. The solutions are too numerous to list here. They are seemingly as varied as the occupational groups from which they spring but they all have one thing in common. They all assume that there is, or could be, in the world of Capitalism a defensible social principle by which wages could be fixed at a "proper" level. They all ignore the facts of Capitalist life. As practical solutions they are all so much trash.

The Law of the Jungle

Capitalism knows no social principle of distribution according to need, or responsibility, or skill, or training, or risk, or so-called "value of work," or "usefulness to the community." If Capitalism has anything that approaches a principle it is that income shall be in inverse proportion to work. If you own capital in sufficient amount you never need work at all, and the more you avoid work in order to enjoy luxurious living the greater the esteem and attention you will have bestowed upon you.

The Socialist knows why this is and how the system works. Society's means of living are owned by the propertied class, the Capitalists who are in business to provide themselves with their kind of income, profits. They employ the working class in order to make profit out of them, a proceeding the working-class are forced to accept because they are propertyless. The Capitalist pays as little as he can for the kind of worker he needs. All the worker can do is to bargain and struggle to get as much out of the employer as circumstances permit and what circumstances permit depends on whether the Capitalist needs the kind of skill the worker has to offer. If the employer needs a certain kind of skill and if the number of workers having that skill is limited the employer will have to pay accordingly for it, he will have to pay more to the skilled than to the unskilled worker. But if owing to the decline of a given trade, or the invention of a machine, which replaces craftsmanship, skilled operatives are not in demand their wages will fall.

In the depression of the nineteen thirties apprenticed engineering craftsmen, skilled coal miners, university graduates, and agricultural labourers, were a drug on the

market. Capitalism had no need for all there were of them and their wages fell. During the war Capitalism had need of coal and food, of engineering and chemical products, and all these groups had their chance to push up wages beyond the rise of the cost of living. "Merit" and "human needs" and "usefulness to the community" and all the other fine-sounding phrases, have nothing to do with it. What counts is whether the worker is useful to the Capitalist, and the only usefulness the Capitalist knows is usefulness in making profit. The only argument he has to listen to is the fact of inability to get sufficient of the workers he needs, and the amount of strike pressure trade union organisation can bring to bear to prevent him getting enough workers at the wage he offers.

Is it crude, callous and inhuman? Of course it is. It is the law of the jungle, the only law Capitalism knows.

And has Socialism any alternative to offer? Indeed it has, but by Socialism we mean the Socialism of Socialists, not the spurious State Capitalist nostrums offered by the Attlees and Bevans and the clique who run Capitalism in Russia.

All over the world the cut throat Capitalist wages system operates and only Socialists have as their aim the replacement of Capitalism by a Socialist system of society in which there will be no wages system, no propertied class and working class, the one living on income from property and the other on wages. Under Socialism people will work cooperatively to produce what all need and all will freely take what they need out of the products and services cooperative effort achieves.

Of course the pseudo-Socialists named above all pay lip-service to the ideal of abolishing Capitalism and the wages system but whether or not they understand what they are talking about they show by their actions and programmes that they do not intend to seek that solution. They all in their time bleat about the need for bold, far-reaching action but all with one accord recoil from the Socialist objective they profess to desire.

For the working class of the world the choice is simple, either to take the organised political action necessary to introduce Socialism or to continue with Capitalism. The one thing that cannot be bad is to impose on the Capitalist jungle some socially acceptable and satisfying wages policy.

H.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," March, 1906)

The Ethics of Revolution

Some good people in the Labour movement . . . are keenly endeavouring to get the workers to study ethics. They urge that the world would be much better and happier if only people were more moral and altruistic, and they further argue that if the working class, the despised and rejected of men, would display a higher morality, the Capitalist class would be converted to the Labour movement. The Socialist has one of his most insidious foes in the ethical culturist. Their position is a denial of the materialist basis of Socialism, because it is simply an appeal to the individual, as though the majority of individuals could elevate themselves above their environment. If the teaching of ethics were all that is required to bring social salvation, how comes it that after 2,000 years of the teaching of the ethics of Christianity for example, the

hewers of wood and drawers of water are worse off, than they have been for ages? Buddha, Confucius and others taught the Golden Rule long before Christ, yet the world is little the better.

The teaching of love and brotherhood, in a system that exists owing to the robbery of one class by another, is immoral. The moral course is that followed by the Socialist, who points out why this robbery takes place, explains the method by which it is done, and shows how it may be ended.

Standing firmly all the time on his material philosophy, the Socialist keeps clear of the illogical position taken up by the ethicist and the alleged Labour leader. Realising that with a society whose material foundation is conducive to a better relationship between man and

man, a higher morality must ensue because of this advance in civilisation, he endeavours to teach his fellow members of the working class the opposition of the Capitalist class and their system to their interests, and the immorality of their position, and he organises them for the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of the higher system—Socialism. The revolutionist is the most moral because he points out the causes of today's evils, and organises to uproot them, while the Utopian ethicist leads the workers, consciously or

unconsciously, in a manner calculated to breed despair, since they do not show the way to social emancipation, but on the contrary, blind them to the root causes of their misery. Revolution alone is moral, because it is consistent with the facts of life. The revolutionist is the true ethical teacher, because he endeavours to establish a form of society in which man's relationship with his fellows would necessitate a higher ethic than that of today.

CHILDREN'S STREET GAMES

A Free-for-all sample investigation recently conducted by this writer revealed that, of a hundred and fifty children around thirteen years old, only one knew a commoney from an alley taw and none at all could play Jimmy Knacker. On the other hand, almost every one was *au fait* with TV panel games, space-travel and the Hollywood pantheon. Childhood pleasures have undergone a minor revolution, with most adults uncertain of its merits against the recollection that they had to make their own amusements in their young days.

That is true enough, but it means little. It would be more accurate to say that people of all ages "made their own amusements," in the not-so-distant past and now take them second-hand, canned and standardized: the front-room piano and the family party have faded equally with Hopscotch and Tip-cat. Television, films and the other leisure-machines are obvious factors in the change, but its real nature lies much deeper in modern society.

Children's games are traditional. Many of them, like skipping, see-saws and swinging, began as ancient work-rituals: the reason why each had its immovable "season." Hoops were an autumn pastime, marbles were for Lent, and skipping belonged to springtime. So did whipping tops; Greek and Roman boys played with them, as well as leap-frogging and doing the labyrinth mime we know as Hopscotch. And there were the war games—Tom Tiddler's Ground, Prisoner's Base, and half a dozen others which existed five hundred years ago under names like The Last Couple in Hell and Barley-Break: the hunting and hiding games; the courtship games—Queen Anne, Drop Handkerchief and so on.

There was more than just playing them. Each had its proper ritual, beginning with a counting-out rhyme to choose the victim or the sides. Most, excepting the ones where breath was needed for vigorous action, depended on accompanying chants or songs. There were scores of them, from ball-bouncing and skipping rhymes to things like:

"The wind, the wind, the wind blows high.
Snowflakes flutter from the sky—
Lizzie Gordon's going to die
For want of the Golden City."

Though the past tense has been used, they are still played, of course. Some of the rhymes have taken strictly modern imagery, like this one for skipping:

"Hi, Roy Rogers, how about a date?
Meet you round the corner at half-past eight.
I can do the rumba, I can do the splits,
I can wear my skirt up high above my hips."

All of it has become increasingly rare, however. It is not merely that new amusements have superseded traditional ones, or even that road traffic has made the streets dangerous playgrounds. Children's play is functional, a part of the social pattern, and its transformation is part of the change in urban social life that has taken place in modern times.

Education today means schooling—the mass imposi-

tion of basic knowledge, skills and attitudes. In its real sense, however, education is the process of adapting children to the world they have to live in. Obviously that process is not limited to school: it takes place at home, in the streets and everywhere, and play is part of it. Through play, young children have learned from older ones the ways and ethics of their communities and the essentials of co-operative living. That is still the case in present-day primitive societies, and it was so in ours until recent times.



This was the real function and significance of all the children's games and songs. Little girls singing "Poor Jenny is A-weeping" or "Wallflowers" were not merely playing an ancient ring game but learning to accept and evaluate the fact of death; just as the Drop Handkerchief game was imitation and rehearsal of the conventions of pairing and courtship; just as, in even the rough games, everyone learned to behave co-operatively so that the game could go on and be enjoyed. Folklore, morality, sex, sociability—all were learned through play, together with agility of hand, foot and eye.

The division of labour in our society is such that one generation's experience means little to the next. That in itself is one reason why lore and attitudes are no longer commonly handed down. More than that, however, the division is marked out in childhood. Children

seeming to have special ability are creamed off, classified and made conscious of the separation at anything from seven years old. So are the "backward" ones. Hewers of wood and plan-makers in prospect are labelled and stratified and pressed along divergent roads without much common ground between.

It is common nowadays to speak of parents' having abdicated in favour of teachers and administrators, as if the working class were directly to blame for the State's having assumed charge of their children. In fact, anyone who tried to keep his child out of it all would find things made very difficult for him. The real point is that, as community life has fallen away, the formal communal function of education has been taken over to an ever-increasing extent by specialists with the State's authority behind them. In the first place it was to instil simple knowledge; now, there are few aspects of childhood life it does not touch.

Thus, the function of children's games has largely ceased to exist. Physical agility is no longer acquired climbing trees, or with rope tied to the railings; it is the concern of the Physical Training teacher, who has hoops and ropes and climbing frames and calls them "apparatus." Rounders, touch and stump-cricket? in the "organized Games" lesson on the Council's playing-field. The rituals, codes and knowledge have been transmuted into rules. In "The Reasonable Life," Clifford Gessler's delightful book about the Polynesians, children are described as playing with and learning from one another without adult direction; our society, on the other hand, has led to direction in practically every human activity—including those of childhood.

One result of the handing-over of communal and personal responsibilities to authority-bearing specialists is that many people have come to take it as the natural order: the authorities should do this, that and something else. Another, in part, is the amount of tension and frustration which characterizes life in the modern world: the outstanding frustration—and one unprecedented in history—is that of people's desire for association with and acceptance by their fellows. It is worth considering the matter, however in relation to the lives of children themselves. There is a great deal of alarm nowadays about

the apathy and recalcitrancy said to be rife in State elementary schools; there are the juvenile delinquency figures—and, of course, the Teddy Boys.

Why do numbers of young people today adopt and display anti-social attitudes? Various immediate causes are fairly obvious; for example, statistics from all over the world show a clear relationship between delinquency and broken or unstable homes. The bigger, more important point is that anti-social behaviour is a matter of the organization of society. In this case, its strongest single cause is the absence of former communal, co-operative living and thinking.

The Teddy Boy is one product of an un-social society. He has grown up in a world where life is individualized and behaviour depends less and less on communal sanction. He has been educated insofar as knowledge and attitudes have been more or less forcibly inculcated from above: in the wider sense of education, of learning in and from a community, he has not been educated at all. And the dominant ideals of the Capitalist world, the mainspring of his behaviour-pattern, are of ends justifying means and might being right.

Thus, the disappearance of traditional children's games is part of a change in social life which has taken place in our time and has added fresh problems to those inherent in our society. The latest generations of children know only a world which is atomized, congested but lonely, which can teach them little about co-operation and social harmony. Criticisms of schooling and of the behaviour of young people are easy and plentiful. The real criticism, however, is of society. The millions spent on our educational systems are directed to training children to take their places as workers and consumers. In a world organized for human satisfaction and not for profit, the purpose would be very different.

R. COSTER.

"The Reasonable Life" is published by The John Day Company of New York and Longmans Green of Toronto. It describes everyday life among the Polynesians of the South-East Pacific, who have not so far had the good fortune to discover tension, neurosis and the other benefits of Capitalist society.

THE PASSING SHOW

Declaration of Washington

The declaration issued jointly by President Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden after their recent talks in Washington must long stand as an object-lesson in the art of inserting the maximum amount of inaccuracy in the minimum amount of space. The declaration occasionally approaches the truth when it deals with the misdeeds of "the other side," the Soviet bloc.; but when they dwell on their own records and aims, the president and the Premier rarely get even with hailing distance of the facts.

Theological Gambit

The Anglo-American leaders begin roundly:

"We are conscious that in this year of 1956, there still rages the age-old struggle between those who believe that man has his origin and his destiny in God and those who treat man as if he were designed merely to serve a state machine."—(*The Times*, 2-2-56.)

Eden and Eisenhower thus blandly ignore both those of no religion who support the Anglo-American bloc, and all those fervent religionists—including the large Russian Orthodox Church, for example—who would die

for the Stalinists. In fact the struggle between the two blocs has nothing whatever to do with religion or irreligion: each state has its tame churches to give it the divine sanction: the struggle is between the British ruling class and the American ruling class (who happen to have sufficient mutual interests to support an alliance) on the one hand, and the Russian ruling class (usually supported by their Chinese opposite numbers) on the other. But the desire for self-justification is strong: hence the habit of claiming the approval of the Almighty.

One for Ripley

But this is merely an opening canter. Warming to its theme, the second paragraph of the declaration runs (believe it or not):

"Because of our belief that the state should exist for the benefit of the individual and not the individual for the benefit of the state, we uphold the basic right of peoples to governments of their own choice."

Or, as one might paraphrase it when one has regard to reality, "because of our belief in something we don't

believe in, we uphold what we deny." The claim of Eden and Eisenhower to believe that "the state should exist for the benefit of the individual and not the individual for the benefit of the state" surely borders on the farcical. Both the President and the Prime Minister were in the highest counsels of Great Britain and the U.S.A. during the last war, when the state in each of these countries so far denied the elementary rights of the individual that it conscripted millions of its citizens and sent them off to kill other individuals and be killed themselves. Not only do Eden and Eisenhower believe that the individual exists for the benefit of the state: they go further—they believe that when called upon he should cease to exist for the benefit of the state. But official pronouncements would not read so well if they confined themselves to the truth, nor would they make such good propaganda.

What can be said about the second part of this almost incredible paragraph, where the signatories allege that they uphold the basic right of peoples to governments of their own choice? When one thinks of the Prime Minister giving his consent to this clause, at a time when British troops are on an active footing in British Guiana, Cyprus, Kenya and Malaya expressly to prevent their people's having governments of their own choice, one can only feel grateful that the cares of high office have not deprived Sir Anthony of his sense of humour.

All my own work

Lack of space prevents the analysis of the Declaration in the detail it deserves. But one other paragraph must be quoted:

"During the past ten and more years 600 million men and women in nearly a score of lands have, with our support and assistance, attained nationhood. Many millions more are being helped surely and steadily towards self-government. Thus, the reality and effectiveness of what we have done is proof of our sincerity."

Since Britain has been in the Empire racket longer than America, the insincerity of this statement is more immediately obvious in regard to Eden than Eisenhower. Britain attempted to retain her Indian Empire (which contains the great majority of the 600 millions referred to) by every means at her disposal. A great army was maintained there; any expression of opinion in favour of independence invited ruthless official action; if the people demonstrated for independence they were forcibly scattered and the leaders (including for example Pandit Nehru) thrown into British jails. Riots and shootings and massacres marked the progress of the years. At length the British power waned, and the British State could no longer afford to maintain the repression in face of the almost unanimous opposition of the peoples of the Indian Empire. And so the Attlee Government withdrew from India, being no longer physically capable of remaining there. It is this eviction of the British by the Indians which Sir Anthony Eden now tries to describe as a British achievement. It is as if a boxer, after fighting a dozen rounds, is at length knocked out; and as he is carried from the ring opens one eye long enough to remark "I retire voluntarily from the contest and claim all the credit for my opponent's victory."

Who said aggression?

No doubt if the British are thrown out of Cyprus this will also be counted as a great British contribution to the establishment of self-government, and the British ruling class will expect the Greek ruling class (which will take over from them) to be duly grateful. But until this happens the task is to explain why Cyprus should not have self-government. In this connection a recent letter

written to *The Times* (11-2-56) by Lord Vansittart is of considerable interest.

It appears that Britain has every right to be in Cyprus, because it "belongs to us." Since Lord Vansittart coyly refrains from explaining how it came to "belong to us," a word on the subject might not be out of place. Briefly, in 1877-8 Russia attacked Turkey, with the aim of seizing part of her Balkan territories; Great Britain, in the role of knight in shining armour, sprang to Turkey's side to defend her against Russian aggression; the fleet was ordered to the Turkish coast, and alarm and counter-alarm succeeded each other. But when the smoke had cleared away, it was found that the noble British Government had taken advantage of the crisis to force Turkey to hand Cyprus over to British rule. The Cypriots, of course, had not been consulted.

It is this expert piece of sharp practice which Lord Vansittart now contends gives "us" the right to stay in Cyprus.

A little late to recant

But do not think that Lord Vansittart's endorsement of this smooth-faced knavery means that he has no principles. He has. Or rather he used to have. He refers in his letter to "the primary principles for which millions died in two vast wars": and among them, it will be remembered, was the principle of self-determination. None was more vociferous than Lord Vansittart in his clamour for strict measures against German aggression before 1939, and for the merciless prosecution of total war against Germany between 1939 and 1945. But now, it appears, Lord Vansittart has had second thoughts. The principle for which millions died, to quote his own letter, no longer engages his support. That "self-determination should be automatic" Lord Vansittart now decries as a "delusion." The Germans under Hitler, of course, were in favour of self-determination in certain circumstances; it was only the application of the principle to countries like Czechoslovakia and Poland that they objected to, because there it was against the economic interest of the German ruling class. Lord Vansittart has now accepted the pre-1945 German view of the matter, which could be summarized as "self-determination unless it conflicts with one's own interests."

And so Lord Vansittart changes his mind. But all the British soldiers who died in the war of which Lord Vansittart was the prophet, and in which he beat the drums louder than anyone else, they stay dead. The principle they thought they were fighting for is now found by the noble lord to be a "delusion." If only it was as easy to bring the millions of dead to life again as it is for a politician to change his principles!

ALWYN EDGAR.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day ...	1/- (Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
Russia Since 1917 ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
Socialism ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Socialism or Federal Union? ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism? ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Nationalisation or Socialism? ...	6d. (" " 8d.)

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

HOW TO LIVE ON YOUR £100 A WEEK

IN the course of this little piece, our readers are invited to try their wits at guessing in a sort of "What's my Line" manner, the identity of the person we have in mind. We can offer no special prizes of vacuum cleaners, cars or trips to Hollywood for any correct answers because you may not have swallowed the Labour and Tory party lines about the class-struggle being a "myth." You are warned that the person in question could be employed as any of the following—(or has some alternative means of living such as an Old Age Pensioner), a road sweeper, bus driver, school teacher, coal miner, docker, textile worker, an engineer or an "over paid" meat porter in Smithfield Market. Now for clue number one, the amount received by our "object" is only £100 per week and the *Daily Express*, well known for its distortion of Socialism and its supports of wage claim, pub-



lishes some details in its issue of January 23, 1956. The "object" says "£100 a week doesn't go far," and this is why she lives in a villa 15 miles outside Paris, and is being sued by her husband for £75,000 worth of jewellery.

Ambitious workers whose idea of curing their poverty is to win the Pools, regard this paltry sum as more than enough for the rest of their lives. Simple arithmetic shows, however, that if a Pools winner spent £75,000 on jewellery there would not be much left for that "little car and little house" (the Capitalists always find it pays to keep workers thinking "little").

Now as the result of the husband's changed feelings the villa was scantily furnished; "it contained: one settee, two small chairs, an old garden table, no carpets, no curtains." Without going to New Bond Street, which caters entirely for the "lower income groups," we could buy enough working class "furniture" in six months to fill a warehouse with half the "objects" income, and not on the never-never either.

To anyone so naive as to think she is well off she says "it's about time the truth were told." She married a Swiss multi-millionaire in Ceylon 18 months ago and "among the presents to her: a Caribbean Island, two cars, a black panther." Remember that set of cheap pillow cases you bought when Bill got married? In the court she will be claiming £25,000 to furnish her prefab—

sorry, villa—plus £100 a week when she is finding it so hard to keep herself, the panther, ten dogs, two Brazilian parrots and two humming birds on.

Answering questions by the *Daily Express* reporter, whose job in life is to chase around after the wealthy to keep the workers informed, our "object" says regarding the gems and paintings "I've no idea of the total value, perhaps £75,000. The Old Masters? I have one—an El Greco he gave me for my birthday." And about the £400 a month "That might seem a lot, but it doesn't go far with a 70 acre estate. I live quietly here since the divorce writ came through. I haven't put a foot inside Balmain's or Dior's—haven't bought a thing." Apart from in London, "where I did buy two Borzoi dogs because I need some protection here. I have eight other dogs all Pekinese."

If a superannuated worker, at the age of 65, having worked 35 or 40 years for the same exploiter, gets £400 to spend the rest of his life on, maybe 10 or 15 more years, he is considered comfortably off and well provided for yet this sum is a month's allowance for our hard-up "object." In the back-yard—sorry the grounds, among the terraces, the fountain nymph and sagging model tea-house, there was a "huge swimming pool with a great hole in one side" which the husband does not seem to care about. "I feel he should put the place back in order," she said. Well, that's the story, or rather a story, one of the many that come up. Of course by the standards of her class, Baroness von Thyssen, ex-model Nina Dyer, is hard pushed; after all, Monte Carlo and such places are not kept going by people who get only £100 a week. The amazing thing is that the members of the working class who make all the wealth and are always told the boss can't afford more wages, continue nevertheless to take a keen interest in the exploits of Sir Bernard Docker, Aly Kahn, Rita Hayworth and Prince Rainier, etc.; amazing that is until we take account of the drab, colourless and repetitive lives workers live. Perhaps, then, we can understand the attraction of the circus.

To understand it is not, however, to condone it, because as Socialists we know the kind of world the workers can establish when they wake up—the world of Socialism, with no contrasts of riches and poverty, peace and war, but a community of social equals freely taking what they need from the wealth they have produced in co-operation without the hindrance of wages and profits.

H. B.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

MARXISM AND INEVITABILITY

The Critics Criticised

"There's a destiny that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we may."

Is Marxism the prose Rubaiyat of economic fatalism? Many pseudo-Marxists have half believed it. Quite a few critics of Marxism—Eastman, Baber, Popper, etc., have wholly asserted it. A host of sentimental liberals and political do-gooders have also chosen to see Marxism as a secularised version of—"and the good must come to pass." For such critics Marxism is either a synonym for Kismet or a variation of "The Lord will provide."

It is true that the Communist Manifesto states, "Capitalism is its own grave-digger; its fall and the victory of the proletariat are alike inevitable." This has been taken up by opponents of Marxism and echoed and re-echoed down the corridor of the years as evidence of the fact that Marxism spells out fatalism with a capital f. Yet anything less like religious or philosophical quietism than the Communist Manifesto it would be hard to imagine. Not only do its pages breathe political activism but it ends with a stirring call to action—"Workers of the world unite," utterly at variance with any predestined assumptions. It is not difficult, however, to tear a sentence from its context and make the author appear to say the opposite of what he actually meant.

Now this particular type of criticism of Marxism pivots on the word "inevitability." If we are to believe the critics of Marx the term inevitability, especially as related to human society, is synonymous with fatalism or predestination—"The moving finger writes and having writ moves on." Thus in the Marxist scheme of things, vide the critics, inevitability means that human wills are writ so small as to be virtually non-existent.

The word "inevitability" as used by the critics in reproaching Marx carries a stigma; the stigma being that human beings are but puppets in some vast cosmic process. But is that the only significance which can be given to the word? One of course does not deny that in a given context the word "inevitability" can be synonymous with fatalism. What one does deny is that in the Marxist context they mean the same thing.

Let us, to paraphrase Marx, consider the word "inevitability" a little more closely and see how its meaning varies with the context. Thus we say night, inevitably follows day. Do we imply by such a statement that fatalism or predestination of some kind is involved in the rotation of the earth on its axis? It can, we think, be agreed that the regular sequence of events connected with the solar system has nothing to do with fatalism or any other kind of supernaturalism. Some one might, of course, say "but is it not true that men are nevertheless powerless to control solar events?" Here it would seem that inevitability implies the powerlessness of men. But surely the answer is that such events being non-human have nothing to do with the powers possessed by socially organised men. Therefore the question of powerlessness on the part of humans in non-human processes does not arise. The power of human beings lies in the fact of their ability to understand and utilise natural phenomena to their social advantage.

Again the inevitable sequences of events which occur in the solar system are of inestimable advantage to humans during the course of their lives. It enables one to go to bed supremely confident that after a night's sleep

one will wake up and it is morning. And to feel assured that in making an appointment a week hence the solar sequence of things will not have been reversed. If solar events were so arbitrary that in the words of the song "when it's night time in Italy it's Wednesday over here" then life on this planet would be a matter of conjecture. If inevitability, then, entails some aspect of a regularised and sequential eternity one can only add—long live inevitability.

One can further expand the advantage which inevitability has for us humans. Thus if we know that "A" will always bring about "B" then the certainty of this knowledge gives us an assured basis for utilising it. Such knowledge not only gives us power to understand the world but the power to change it.

On the other hand, if events were so capricious that water raised to a certain temperature did not always produce steam, or in switching on an electric kettle the water got colder instead of hotter, then the organisation of knowledge consequent upon an inevitable sequence of things, would be impossible.

It does not follow then that inevitability pre-supposes the powerlessness of humans. It can, in fact, imply the contrary. Thus, for example, if the Moscow Dynamos were to meet a scratch village eleven we could sav the result would be inevitable. This would not be because of the inability of the scratch side to kick a ball but of the highly trained athletic power of the Dynamos.

Now the working class in Capitalist society constitute not only the bulk of the population but are a highly trained productive class. Potentially they are the most powerful social group and the only section capable of basically transforming existing social conditions. When Marx spoke of social inevitability he was not as vulgar critics such as Eastman and Isaiah Berlin contend, postulating mysterious agencies beyond the control of humans, but had in mind the latent powers resident in the working class.

Marxists recognise, however, that inevitability has a twofold character; one of denial as well as one of affirmation. From one aspect it can be considered as a restraint on human power. From another, a source of possibilities and opportunities. Thus Capitalism through its social productive agencies constitutes a fetter on the free and fullest use of human skills and productive resources; just as the ownership of these productive resources by a class gives them power over the lives of others and inhibits their free development. Only in a classless society can human activity be equal, creative and shared.

If then extant society gives rise to certain social consequences inseparable from its existence, i.e. if "A" always affects "B" then, in order to eliminate "B" we must get rid of "A." It is this recognition of the "must" which makes possible our decision to achieve the "ought." Because the pressures and conflicts of Capitalism are permanent, powerful and pervasive, it becomes not a matter of preoccupation for the few but the concern of the many. If "A" is then a necessary condition for "B" this itself promotes the idea and need of getting rid of the cause. To say that in a system such as Capitalism which generates the consequences of its existence as a continuous and

(Continued on page 41)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

MARCH



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

PLANLESS BOOMS AND RUNAWAY SLUMPS

ALTHOUGH the periodical crises under post-war Labour Government rather took the shine off the idea of planning there is still a lot of belief in it. A hundred years ago those who believed that Capitalism is the best of all possible systems had a different idea. They thought that if each individual went about the business of making money or getting a job on his own the medley of efforts and strivings would, like a mosaic, combine together to make harmony for the nation as a whole. It did not work like that and 19th century Capitalism was rent by class struggle and rocked from time to time in the cycle of boom—crisis—slump.

So the theory grew up, not only in Labour Party circles, that the remedy must lie in the direction of planning. The same idea caught on in other parts of the world and many people believe that governments, alone or in international organisations, can and do plan and control the course of economic events. That is why the "inflation" crisis of the past 12 months and the dark forebodings of another slump inspire such bewildered comments from the "experts" and the newspapers. For if everything is planned and under control then the crisis and possible slump must have been planned—which is absurd—or must be due to pure ignorance and incompetence by the Government and its advisers—which is now meat for the Opposition but poison for the Tories. Certainly the Government's defenders have much to explain away. To start with, the theory that everything is planned to run smoothly according to design, requires, not only

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD March, 1956

that there shall be no crisis and no slump to come after it, but also that there shall be no bursting boom to come before it. So the boom itself proved the failure of planning, though only last year the Government spokesmen were claiming it as their own work and soliciting votes on the strength of it.

The next thing is the "inflation" from which they say we are all in dire peril. They are all now agreed, Government and Opposition alike, that "inflation" is the enemy. A year ago, in February, 1955, the Government raised the bank-rate from 3½ per cent. to 4½ per cent. This was the first step to halt that enemy, and it was followed in July by the instruction to the banks to restrict loans. These measures were supposed to be the cure. They failed, and in October came the emergency budget with more measures. Why then the need for more and still more remedies to curb demand and capital investment? The answer is in the admission in a *Daily Mail* editorial of 17 February, 1956, that "inflation . . . gains momentum every day," and in the declaration of Sir Eric Gore-Brown, chairman of Alexanders Discount Company, (a declaration endorsed by the financial editor of the *Manchester Guardian* 17/2/56) that "in his view monetary restraints, for example the use of the bank-rate and a credit squeeze, could not either alone or in combination, stop the spiral of wages and prices."

The leader-writer of the *Daily Mail* (17/2/56) seeks to condone the failure of the Government to control this crisis with the plea that "in some ways the looming crisis is one we have not encountered before."

This crisis, according to him, is different because unlike earlier ones, it

"could be called a crisis of prosperity, for it is caused by the weight of earned money making undue demands on our resources."

Far from being novel this has always been a mark of booms and crises. Every boom has the superficial appearance of "too much money chasing too few goods" as every depression has the superficial appearance of "too many goods chased by too little money."

But booms and slumps are not caused by monetary factors but by conditions in the field of production and marketing, basically by the class ownership of the means of production and of production for sale and profit.

When the Capitalists are convinced that they can look forward to a period of expanding sales and rising profits they rush in to enlarge their factories, buy more machinery and raw materials, and bid for more workers. They all use what money they have and try to borrow more. In these conditions prices and wages rise and the competition for loans sends up interest rates. The raising of the bank-rate a year ago only put the seal on a rise of interest rates that was already happening.

Anyone who thinks this has not happened before need only look at the situation in 1920. There was then a seemingly unlimited demand for goods and for workers. The trades unions (mainly of skilled workers) that kept an unemployment register showed unemployment of about 1 per cent., as it is now. The cost of living was rising, it jumped by 23 per cent. in the year ended November, 1920. Bankers and others were complaining of "inflation" and the Cunliffe Committee had reported at the end of 1919 on measures to combat it.

And the bank rate was in the news as it is today. In February, 1956, it was raised from 4½ per cent. to 5½ per cent. In November, 1919, it was raised from 5 per cent. to 6 per cent., and in April, 1920, to 7 per cent. Then, as now, one of its declared aims was to discourage lending by the banks. Mr. A. W. Kirkcaldy

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD March, 1956

in his "British Finance" (1921, p. 55) says of the first of those two rises:—"in the main it was designed to check the speculative movement that became pronounced during the closing months of 1919, and to administer an effective check to the demand for further expansion of bank credit, if not to commence a gradual process of deflation."

Inflation the Friend—or the Enemy?

In 1920 and 1956 inflation is, by common consent, the enemy. It now has not a friend in the world, or at least not one who will disclose his friendship openly. It was not ever thus. In 1932 Lord Beaverbrook's newspapers were running a great campaign for inflation! The *Sunday Express* (15/5/1932) had this:—

"The movement is growing and spreading. Most public men are now in favour of inflation. Practically every Member of Parliament speaking in the debates is an inflationist. Some of them are no longer even shy of the word. The movement is extended to many of the newspapers. It is even being adopted by the *Times*."

Prominent members of the Labour Party were rushing in to support the great new cause of inflation.

Now they have got what they asked for and they like it hardly more than they did the slump situation of 1932 from which inflation was to save them.

Many of them are fearful that this "inflation" crisis may be followed by a slump. (The 7 per cent. bank rate of 1920 preceded the over 2,000,000 unemployed of 1921).

So indeed it may. There are certainly in evidence some of the chaotic features that precede slumps and that in any event provide proof of how planless Capitalism always is and must be.

The American and other governments are embarrassed by the enormous stocks of unsaleable wheat and butter they hold. Was this planned? And the motor manufacturers here and in the U.S.A. are cutting back production "temporarily" because of stocks of unsold cars. But simultaneously all the big motor companies are going ahead with plans to expand their manufacturing capacity, amounting in the aggregate to many tens of millions of pounds. This is not planning but gambling. They all hope that demand will increase again and absorb their still further expanded production. They all fear

MARXISM AND INEVITABILITY—continued from page 39.

cumulative process men will never, never be able to correctly diagnose their social ills is to condemn them to a moronic level utterly out of keeping with their own history.

The Marxist concept of inevitability links the negative and positive aspect of the social situation and reveals the driving force of social change.

Socialists do not deny human will and choice. What they say is that if men are to raise themselves to a truly human stature this exploitative set-up where magic and myth, charlatanism and violence are agencies through which social problems are mediated, must go and the choice can only be a social arrangement of free and equal access to social wealth. Given the means the choice is inevitable.

Among the critics of Marx, and they are notorious, are those who fail to grasp the aspects of affirmation and denial in the concept of inevitability. For them social

that there is a possibility that demand may collapse instead of increasing, but they can't be sure, and at the moment no big company dare drop out of the race to design and produce new and better cars and more of them. The company that ceases to compete fades out. And as if the car manufacturers of the Western Powers had not enough to worry about Russia too is now an exporter.

But who knows how Capitalism will run in the next five years or even one year? It may happen soon that the world's markets will collapse as in 1921 and 1930—or it may not; or it may happen that particular countries, among them Britain, and particular industries may be hard hit while the rest may be little affected. Such things have happened before and could happen again. The evidence does not by any means all point to a serious depression. A large and rapidly growing place in production is being taken by the new atomic and electronic industries. For production and for military purposes enormous new investments are going on, and will go on even if depression does hit some established industries. A case in point is the raising of £24 million new capital by Associated Electrical Industries Ltd., only one of the many firms interested in this new and rapidly expanding field. It will, of course, seem to the men inside each of firms such as A.E.I., as to the men inside the motor firms, that they are carefully planning every move they make and with every possible effort to foresee the conditions in which their products will be coming on to the market one year or many years ahead. But this is all beside the point as far as world demand and world supply are concerned. While every British firm is planning to sell its products in the world market, so are similar firms and governments in every other country. They do not know very much about the eventual size of the potential world demand for all their products, and they know less still about the total supply there will be to satisfy the demand when all these unrelated plans for expanded production are completed and the bigger flow of products pours out. They all hope to get a large enough share of the market and all hope that the price they get will be a profitable one. They all hope, but they cannot know. They all gamble on the future. And every now and then the gamble produces chaotic conditions of such extent as to disorganise all markets and slow down all production. Capitalism is that sort of system and there is no cure except Socialism.

laws are another name for pre-determinism or an animistic notion of causality. They regard society, if they can commit themselves to such an organised notion, as a laissez-faire arrangement which can be altered and re-altered like a meccano set. Having no social charts or compass they remain as "free" as a cockle boat in mid-ocean.

There is also irony in the criticism of Marxism which asserts that not only is Marx's inevitability, fatalism, but Socialism is utterly impossible. To the Marxist "aye" they can only counter with an everlasting "nay." Their inevitability is shot through and through with fatalism, a sublime belief that inscrutable agencies control men and make it impossible for them to master a world.

Such critics can be shown on analysis to be supporters of the "eternal status quo." For that reason their misunderstanding of Marxism is perhaps—inventable.

E. W.

OUR COMPLAINT AGAINST THE "EVENING STANDARD"

NEGATIVE REPLY FROM THE PRESS COUNCIL

IN October last the *Evening Standard* (12/10/55) published an article by Sir Beverley Baxter, M.P. about the annual conference of the Labour Party, which he described however as the *Socialist Party of Great Britain*.

We wrote to Sir Beverley Baxter asking "why go out of your way to give to the Labour Party a name that you know is not its own, and why you select for that purpose, also as you know, the name borne by this organization."



which incidentally was formed before the Labour Party."

He replied as follows:—

"I have noted your letter of disapproval and am obliged for the trouble you took in writing to me."

We then wrote to the Editor of the *Evening Standard* enclosing a copy of the correspondence with Baxter. From the Editor, Mr. Percy Elland, we received an equally brief reply:—

"Thank you for sending me these letters between yourself and Sir Beverley Baxter. I have nothing to add to this correspondence."

We then (on 15 November) sent the correspondence to the Press Council with the following letter:—

"Dear Sir,

We wish to bring to your notice an example of deliberate presentation of incorrect information in the Press. As you will see from the enclosed copies of letters written by us to Sir Beverley Baxter and the Editor of the *Evening Standard* respectively and their replies, a deliberately inaccurate statement was published but the writer of the article and the Editor both declined to treat seriously a reasonable complaint.

It would seem to us that deliberate falsification of this kind is incompatible with a claim to publish accurate reports.

What is the purpose of this particular practice on the part of those concerned we are unable to guess. We would like to have your views on the matter.

Yours truly,"

Later on (4 January, 1956) we supplied the Council with a copy of an article in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* of June, 1939, showing that at that time Sir Beverley Baxter was habitually describing the Labour Party as the *Socialist Party of Great Britain* in his regular articles in the *Canadian Weekly, MacLean's*.

We had in 1939 sent a copy to Sir Beverley Baxter to remind him (if that were necessary) of his error.

We have now received the decision of the General Council of the Press in a letter dated 20 January, 1956, the Council's Secretary, Mr. Alan Pitt Robbins, C.B.E.

"Dear Sir,

I am instructed to inform you that at its quarterly meeting on January 17th, the Press Council considered your complaint against the *Evening Standard*.

The Council decided to take no action in the matter in view of the fact that readers of the article would clearly understand the organisation to which Sir Beverley Baxter was referring."

We do not find the reason given by the Press Council at all satisfactory because the absence of confusion is by no means as clear as they would have it. Every speaker on the platform of the S.P.G.B. knows by experience that there are large numbers of people who do not know the difference between the S.P.G.B. and the Labour Party. How does the Press Council know that there is no such confusion in the minds of *Evening Standard* readers.

And it would seem that Sir Beverley has had doubts himself, because in the issue of *MacLeans* dated 24 December, 1955, his *London Letter* contains the following:—

"I am sorry to confess that while I rarely attend the Tory Conference I never miss the one held by the Labour Party."

But we shall probably never know why Baxter started the practice years ago (was it one of those silly brain waves of Lord Beaverbrook?) nor why he has abandoned it now—if he has abandoned it now—(perhaps he is going to have one rule for Canada and another for Britain).

Before the Press Council had given us its decision on the complaint against the *Evening Standard* we had published in our issue for January, 1956, the editorial dealing with the faking of reports in the Beaverbrook Press in years past. The Council have taken no action on this (understandably perhaps in view of the lapse of time since the incidents referred to occurred) and their letter to us dated 20 January, 1956, refers only to Sir Beverley Baxter's article in the *Evening Standard* of 12 October, 1955.

There, at the moment, is how the matter stands.

ED. COMM

FOR THE ATTENTION OF MEMBERS

A meeting will be held on Sunday, 18th March at 2 p.m. at Head Office, for the purpose of discussing the holding of classes. All members interested in attending classes are urged to attend and put forward their suggestions.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

There are several items of interest to report and it would be as well to note these in diaries. The Annual Conference Friday, Saturday and Sunday, March 30th, 31st and April 1st, at Conway Hall, is of great interest to all Party members. The proceedings open each day at 11 a.m. Should any Provincial delegates require accommodation or information please write direct (or through branch secretaries) to the General Secretary or Party Organiser. Particularly in cases where delegates require accommodation, it is essential that arrangements are not left to the last moment as it may cause inconvenience to themselves and to members who would prefer to be prepared rather than make hurried arrangements during Conference time.

On the Saturday the Annual Dance and Social will be held in the same hall, and on the Sunday evening a Propaganda Rally will be held, this also at Conway Hall. It is hoped that these three functions will be well attended and members are asked to make every effort to come along.

* * *

Monday, March 12th, at 7.30 p.m., also at Conway Hall, a meeting is being held,—speakers Comrades Bryan and May, the subject "Britain's Departing Empire—the Socialist Attitude." As the Party has not held any large Central London meetings this season, it is hoped that this one will be really successful and the Propaganda Committee urges members to advertise the meeting as widely as possible, the Subject is an interesting one and should attract a good audience.

* * *

Debate with I.L.P., held at the Central Library, Bermondsey, on Monday, 6th February, was very successful, the debate was well attended and although no hard words were bandied (Comrade Wilmott said he was in a very good mood!) both Comrade Wilmott and Frank Maitland (I.L.P.) provided food for thought and made the



evening an interesting one. Joe Thomas (Worker's League) was an able Chairman.

* * *

Ealing Branch.—Ealing Branch are already making active preparations for their May Sales Drive to dispose of 1,000 S.S. In an effort to extend the idea throughout the Party, it has circularised all Branches (and Central Branch members) with a view to getting them to accept certain basic commitments. These are (1) to guarantee to carry out a minimum of eight canvasses; (2) to double their usual order of S.S. (this means also committing themselves to twice their usual financial outgoings); and (3) to insert announcements of their canvassing programmes in the May S.S. Several branches have already responded to this appeal and many others are expected to do so. It is intended to set up a committee, composed of members from the various branches taking part in the drive, to co-ordinate and direct activities. We ask all branches and individual members to co-operate with us to the utmost to make the drive a success.

P. H.

MIDDLE-EAST DIARY

Tory Nationalisation

Nationalisation—that is the state control and regulation of industry on behalf of the Capitalist owners—has, as our pamphlet "Nationalisation Or Socialism" shows, been advocated or put into practice by most political parties. Of recent years, it has become the almost exclusive prerogative of Labour and Communist parties. (Since the recent election defeats, however, the British Labour Party have soft pedalled it, as it is not the vote-catcher it used to be, some workers presumably realising that nationalisation doesn't solve their problems). So that when one hears of a Conservative Party putting forward such measures, one feels the wheel has swung full circle!

One of the most recent and rather curious examples to appear on the nationalisation scene, is the Israeli General Zionist (Conservative) Party. They want to nationalise the various Israeli water-schemes, the Health Service and the Labour Exchanges.

Strangely enough the Mapai (Labour) Party, who have been in power since 1948 are bitterly opposed. Through their domination of the Jewish Agency and the Histadrut (roughly analogous to the T.U.C. but also owning and

controlling the major part of Israel's industry) the Mapai control most of Israel's economy and are extremely loth to give up their political plums!

The General Zionists, on the other hand, want nationalisation measures to break the Mapai Party's hold on the state machine, all of which we can well understand, sectional struggles amongst the Capitalist class being a regular feature of Capitalism. The tragedy is that Israeli workers take sides in this struggle between these parties, (both of whom are only interested in perpetuating Capitalism) instead of organising for Socialism.

Two Classes in Israeli Society

In March of last year the *Jewish Observer and Middle East Review* (25.3.55) informed its readers that

"Israel has become divided into two nations . . . an upper crust and a lower layer. The privileged crust is composed of a variety of substantial and mixed elements who enjoy a privileged position in the country. They are made up by the plutocracy of some three hundred families, by the Government 'aristocracy' which includes a wide range of officialdom, the Histadrutocracy with its manifold operations, the business pressure groups entrenched in the upper

reaches of the General Zionists, the old Kibbutzim, such workers' organisations as the Dan and Egged Bus Co-operatives, the upper reaches of such institutions as the Jewish Agency and of the main political parties—Mapai, the General Zionists.

"The four per cent.: These are the people in the swim. They can get things—flats, cars, trips abroad, the comforts and conveniences of life, or the profits of business, or the positions of power, according to the category to which they belong."

"Newcomers since 1948 comprise 60 per cent. of the population and occupy one per cent. of all Government posts and virtually none in the high grades."

The article goes on to point out that the personal consumption budgets of the above mentioned 300 families is "around £50,000 per year per family at a time when the income of the highest official is less than a tenth of this amount."

All of which was pointed out by the Socialist Party of Great Britain years ago and only goes to prove our contention, that national struggles—whether of the Zionist (Jewish Home) category or otherwise, are not in the interest of the working-class.

"Socialist" Egypt

On Monday, the 16th of January, Mr. Nasser, the Egyptian Premier, announced Egypt's new constitution. The constitution, according to Nasser, provides for the establishment of a "Socialist democratic system of government," (*Jewish Observer and Middle East Review*, 20.1.56. All quotations in this article are from the above dated journal).

With this announcement we see yet another ruling group ushering in Capitalism under the name of Socialism.

The idea of introducing Socialism in Egypt is even more ludicrous than the idea was in Russia in 1917. For (apart from the fact that Socialism must be world-wide) Egypt, like Russia in 1917, is still largely feudal in character, with an agrarian economy—very little industry and an illiterate peasantry and a landowning class, but not the vast resources, mineral and other, that Russia had. This is certainly not the sort of soil in which one would expect to sow successfully the seeds of Socialism—let alone estab-

lish it.

Nasser and his Liberation Rally have their historical counterparts in Cromwell and the Roundheads, and of course the Moslem Brotherhood (which supports them) is not unlike the Puritanical sects that backed up Cromwell initially. In his speech, Nasser said that "Capitalism shall not be allowed to control the Government" but one can take that with a pinch of salt, for Nasser and his confederates, like Cromwell and his gang before them, are acting as the handmaidens of Egyptian Capitalism.

The legislation (decreed by them) on land reform to limit the power of the Landlords; the dethroning of Farouk and declaration of Egypt as a Republic; have all been part of the process. The announcement of this constitution and the ideas contained within it are a continuation of that ineluctable process which is establishing Capitalism in Egypt. The constitution in line with Capitalist ideology declares the "sanctity of private property," but "limits land ownership . . ." "Private economic activity," that is the right to rob (exploit) wage labour, "is free from state interference providing it does not prejudice public interests, endanger the people's security or infringe upon their freedom and dignity." All of which must give any Socialist a big laugh, for who can imagine a wage slavery-capital set-up where the wage slaves are free and dignified. Obviously it is a contradiction in terms; people who have to prostitute their mental and physical capabilities in order to get a wage or salary so that they can live, are not free, except to starve. They are dependent on the Capitalist, and those who are dependent in that sense are certainly not dignified.

The constitution apparently has many of the Labour, Communist, nostrums, such as equality of opportunity (whatever that may be), abolition of social distinctions and social justice, none of which mean anything to a worker under Capitalism. Also provided for are social insurance, public health services and free compulsory education, the last measure of course, being a truly Capitalist "must," for how can one have an efficient Capitalist State without a literate working-class?

JON KEYS.

THE FILMS—

"Trial" and "Desperate Hours"

THESE two films are both thrillers, both are technically excellent, and in both the acting is first-class.

They part company, however, in that *Desperate Hours* sets out merely to entertain, whereas *Trial* moralises about American law and justice, and about the corruptness of the Communist party. The moralising is rather tortuous, for apparently the film-makers have tried to demonstrate that although the American legal system is harmful and corrupt, the corruptness and ruthlessness of the Communist party is even worse, and that American democracy and freedom always triumph in the end, anyway.

The story is set in a small township in Idaho, where there is a Mexican minority. A young white girl dies of heart-failure while with a Mexican boy on a beach, and the boy is charged with murder on the legal principle that if someone causes a death while committing a felony, then he or she is guilty of murder (the alleged felony in this case being indecent assault).

The hero of the story is an idealistic law lecturer (Glenn Ford) who, threatened with expulsion from the University unless he obtains some first-hand legal experience, is taken under the wing of an unscrupulous Com-

munist lawyer (Arthur Kennedy). The boy's trial becomes a matter of political capital for both the prosecutors and the Communist party, both of whom decide that the boy must die, the first because public opinion demands it, and the other because they need a martyr for their political ends. The tension of the film is admirably built up and the trial scenes are extremely effective, but unfortunately, the ideological inconsistencies of the film make it almost implausible. The film tries to lead one to the conclusion that there is always someone to protect American justice and democracy (although why it should be necessary to protect it is not made clear) and in this case it is left entirely to the young idealist to find a legal loophole after the boy has been found guilty. Apparently this vindicates the crooked politicians and lawyers and American justice generally and, to point the moral of the story, the Communist lawyer gets 30 days in jail for contempt. However, this isn't really good enough for it requires only a moment's thought to appreciate that this situation can rarely arise, if at all, so far as the Communist party is concerned, whereas the occasions when politicians and policemen need a conviction to safeguard their office, must be very common.

The picture that is given of American legal methods is both convincing and disturbing, and the account of how money is raised for "fighting funds" and the like is almost horrifying. In this kind of detail the film is extremely good, but when it ventures out into the realms of politics and morals, it becomes bogged down. The Communist party, of course, gets scathing treatment, and to a certain extent this is justified by their "tactics," but I do not think that this film does give an accurate picture of the way in which the American Communists behave. In particular, the speech of the girl (Dorothy McGuire) in which she recounts how she became caught up in the Communist party, and her subsequent disillusionment, is quite unconvincing and almost laughable.

It may well be that the makers of this film considered that their implied criticisms of American law and justice would be made more acceptable to the film-going public by the addition of the anti-Communist propaganda and the melodramatic ending, but if so, they have defeated their object, because the film gives the satisfying impression that justice has been done, and all is well with America, after all. What the film does not do, of course, is to show the cause of the corruption and the basis of the laws that are enforced, i.e. the protection of private property. But that is rather too much to expect from Hollywood.

wood.

Desperate Hours is also a thriller, but this time in the more conventional sense. It has no political axe to grind or moral in the way that *Trial* has, although it also gives a disturbing insight into American police methods. It is a straightforward story of three escaped convicts who find an ideal hideout by terrorising a household and holding the wife and young son hostage while the other members of the family are forced to carry on their normal lives. Here again the tension is well built up, and the principals (Humphrey Bogart as the leader of the three convicts and Frederick March as the father of the family) give splendid performances.

Surprisingly enough, it is the very fact that there is no social moral to the story that gives this film its biggest advantage over *Trial*. There is no sermonising and the film sets out merely to entertain, and it certainly fulfils this object as well as any thriller can. The finale of the story is both inevitable and expected, but nevertheless one's interest is held until the end. This film is an adequate demonstration of the way in which thrillers can be made without either the story being trite or the characters unconvincing, and is certainly well worth your shilling or two.

A. W. I.

PROFESSOR COLE RIDES AGAIN

We received the following letter to which a reply is attached.

S.W.3.

17.1.56.

WORLD SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

Dear Sirs,

In the January issue of the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* there is a reference on p. 3 to "movements like the one sponsored by G. D. H. Cole"—presumably referring to the World Socialist Movement. Since your writer gave a quite erroneous impression of the nature of this movement, I should be obliged if you would publish the following information in the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*.

The World Socialist Movement is not a movement craving for a mass following. Naturally we seek to convince people of the possibility and desirability of world Socialism (as, we understand, does the Socialist Party of Great Britain). Your article refers to "those who . . . have hedged, compromised, and thrown principles to the winds in order to swell the numerical support," etc. However applicable these statements may be to the other movements you mention, they most certainly do not apply to the World Socialist Movement, which is quite explicitly an educational and not a mass movement. Your readers can confirm this by reading our introductory leaflet (obtainable from the above address) which contains a summary of our beliefs in six principles—"the minimum, which can on no account be diluted in an attempt to gain popular support."

Yours,

JOHN H. RODDAM,
Secretary W.S.M.

Executive Committee, S.P.G.B.,
52, Clapham High St., S.W.4.

REPLY

In an article that appeared in an American periodical "The Nation" (April 23rd, 1955), G. D. H. Cole outlined

the practical suggestions he thought would come from the organisation that he proposed should be established. As a preliminary he stated:

"Besides, mass parties cannot think; they can only be influenced by the thinking of individuals or small groups of people who are prepared to think for them."

What would this group of intellectual snobs do?

"The immediate task of this group would be not to act but to think together and to plan—to restate Socialist principles in relation to the most pressing contemporary problems, and to base on these principles a broad programme of action to which the various national movements would be called upon to play their part. Each member of the group, or order, would publicize its ideas in his own country and try to induce the national leaders to take them up."

What is this but an attempt to get a mass following of blind supporters? And what is the nature of the ideas that would be publicized?

"First, a clearly defined attitude towards the making and potential use of atomic weapons; second, a well-thought-out plan of campaign for a 'war upon want' designed to equalize, as nearly as possible, conditions of living in all countries; third, plans for a world economic structure that will avoid the evils both of capitalism and of bureaucratic centralization and will open up for the workers in every country rapidly increasing opportunities for democratic, responsible self-government in their working lives; and fourth the complete ending of imperialist domination, both political and economic, and the extension of self-governing independence to all people."

In other words Cole had gone back to the position of the early Fabians whose policy was largely responsible for the present position of the Labour Party.

Now let us turn to the leaflet which our critic encloses. It opens with the following three paragraphs in heavy black type:

"The World Socialist Movement strives to justify through its members its claim to be the nucleus of the coming world socialist society and not of a new party."

"We regard national governments and institutions as outmoded and aggressively competitive and militaristic in conception; and so we appeal to socialists all over the world to combine with us in the struggle to free ourselves from"

others from that which fetters our thoughts, falsifies our actions and makes a virtue of competition and segregation in place of co-operation and unity.

"We believe that socialists are hampered in their attempt to bring about a socialist world society less by opposition from without than by dissension from within, and our basic principles have been formulated in the belief that they are acceptable to all socialists; but they are the minimum, which can on no account be diluted in an attempt to gain popular support."

The leaflet concludes with the following paragraph, also in heavy black type:

"We do not ask you to renounce existing loyalties; but there is no alternative to accepting new and greater loyalties if a socialist world is to come about."

What is all this empty and dubious phraseology but an attempt to form a mass party. As an inducement they even say, in effect, stick to your old wrong-headed parties but also join us and help to swell our ranks. If this is not throwing principles to the winds, what is? To help swell their following they say, in the body of the leaflet:

"We are not concerned with attacking any country or political party. . . . There is no time to be wasted on destructive criticism."

"We do not believe that a socialist world can be achieved merely by persuading national governments to co-operate more closely. Neither do we believe that people will think as world citizens if we merely attack their deep-rooted patriotic emotions."

"The World Socialist Movement has been started to bring together all the answers to the problems but we want everyone who shares the same reasonable belief to join us and work with us in the pursuit of our ideal."

"But we shall have no rigid dogma that must be accepted before an individual can become a member. Every man and woman who wants a socialist world can find a place in our Movement and will be expected to give, in work and money, according to his means."

Well! Well! Well! "Never mind whether you support nationalisation, Social Credit, the Co-operative Movement or any other anti-Socialist idea that you wrongly believe is Socialist; join us and help to swell our ranks. We are the re-incarnated Fabians waiting to help you along the road to futility again!" It's the old old stuff again with a new label on the bottle.

Now let us take a look at the "ideal" of this new party that is not a party. Here is their definition of it:

"The first need is to outline the sort of world we are striving for. We want a socialist world and by that we mean one in which there is common citizenship under a single code of law, in which every human being has equal rights. It means that there must be world planning for the production of raw materials and the manufacture of basic commodities, with world ownership of essential industries."

What Labourite or advocate of state-ownership would disagree with that vague definition? Most Capitalists would find little fault with it; it is just an expansion of the "Welfare State" idea. There is nothing here about the common ownership and democratic control of the means of production and distribution by, and in the interest of, the whole community. Is there not in this country already common citizenship under a single code of law? Is it not true that the heavy hand of the law falls equally on the millionaire and the pauper if either steals a loaf of bread?

The underlying implication of the leaflet is that its authors envisage Socialism as synonymous with State ownership—with the qualification that it is a world state and not a national one. There is no suggestion of the abolition of buying and selling; no suggestion of a class

cleavage in society, nor of the power of the class state. In the main the leaflet consists of vague generalities, inept proposals, and ignorance of the nature of the social problem and of the only steps that can be taken to solve it. It contains a number of contradictory statements. We have mentioned one or two: the claim that they are not a new party—but everyone should join them; that everyone should stay in their old parties—but ought to join them; that they have no dogma—but basic principles to which all must agree.

Now let us examine the six basic principles to which, they say, all prospective members must agree.

"1. To a socialist racial prejudices, religious intolerance, and class distinctions have no justification."

That does not get anyone farther than polite agreement, though one might argue about the "justification." Many who are not Socialists would agree to it, as they would agree to statements like "Poverty, hunger and oppression have no justification."

"2. The ultimate aim is total disarmament, renunciation of national sovereignty, and positive co-operation between all peoples."

Here we have the cloven hoof. The *ultimate* aim, not the immediate aim. The immediate aim can be the reformers' usual quiverful of projects that lead up blind alleys. What reformer would disagree with that alleged principle?

"3. 'Equality of opportunity' and 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs' should be applied on a worldwide as well as a national scale."

We note that these principles *should* be applied, not *must* or *will* be applied. And what is the meaning of "a world-wide as well as a national scale?" Is it suggested that they are now applied on a national scale? As there is no explanation of what the authors mean by the two principles, either here or in the body of the leaflet, we are left in the dark about how to interpret them.

"4. The means of production, distribution and exchange should belong to the community, and not to any individual or group."

As money is the means of exchange the authors apparently envisage it belonging to the community. Consequently they are assuming the continuance of buying and selling. In an earlier part of the leaflet (which we have already quoted) they say that private enterprise has proved inadequate and the profit motive inefficient, but they do not attack state ownership—or nationalisation—so we are justified in assuming that this is what they mean by belonging "to the community" as this has always been the pseudo Socialist outlook.

"5. True socialism is true democracy and must be practised in political, economic and social fields."

"6. Socialism is a faith, an economic system and a political creed—the only real solution to the problems with which man is faced."

What these two "principles" mean we do not know. There is nothing in the leaflet to explain them, and we take it that they are just some more wind. But we note that Socialism is "a political creed." We assume, therefore, in spite of their denial, that they are in fact a new political party.

One thing, however, can be admitted about these "principles"; they are so vague, windy and diluted that it would be difficult to dilute them any further. Consequently the supporters of multifarious reformist programmes, who falsely call themselves Socialists, should have no difficulty in accepting them and thereby building another road to the wilderness of futility, in the interests conscious or unconscious, of keeping the wheels of Capitalism running along smoothly.

GILMAC.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ... 3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m.

East Street (Walworth) ... Mar. 4th 11 a.m.

" 11th 12.30 p.m.

" 18th 12.30 p.m.

" 25th 11 a.m.

Whitstone Pond (Hampstead) ... 11.30 a.m.

Finsbury Park ... 11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

GROUPS

Will anybody interested in forming a Group or desiring any other information about Groups, apply to Group Secretary, at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

NOTTINGHAM MEETING
On SUNDAY, 25th MARCH, at 7 p.m.

at
CO-OP HALL, NOTTINGHAM
"To-day and To-morrow, the Socialist View."—
R. COSTER.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form below.

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months (6 months, 2/9) for which 5/6 is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

MANCHESTER

Public Meeting on Friday, 16th March at 7.30 p.m.
at Milton Hall, Deansgate
Speaker . . . A. G. ATKINSON
(Subject to be announced)

ISLINGTON LECTURE

Thursday, 22nd March at 8 p.m.
at
CO-OP HALL, 129, Seven Sisters Road
"History of the Working Class Movement"
V. PHILLIPS

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 14th and 28th March, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

A programme of
DOCUMENTARY FILMS

will be shown at

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET

Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.

(Between Clapham North and Clapham Common
Tube Stations)

Mar. 4th "People with a Purpose"—I. F. FLOWER.

A film about Co-operative Societies.

" 11th "Children of the City"—J. TROTMAN.

A study of juvenile delinquency.

" 18th "Local Government"—E. WILMOT.

A history in pictures.

" 25th "Atoms at Work"—BRADLEY.

Refreshments available after Meeting.

MONDAY, MARCH 12th, 1956

at

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.1.

at 7.30 p.m.

Comrades Bryan and May will speak on:

"BRITAIN'S DEPARTING EMPIRE —
THE SOCIALIST ATTITUDE"

Please make a note of the date and time and bring along as many friends as possible, there is ample room and the hall is comfortable and warm.

PROPAGANDA RALLY

at

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.1

on

SUNDAY, 1st APRIL, at 7.30 p.m.

Speakers: R. AMBRIDGE and H. BALDWIN.

Title: "The Organisation for Socialism."

All welcome.

Discussion and Questions.

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (1st, 15th and 29th March.)

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reevy Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCELS meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 12th and 26th March, at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.5.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to A. D. Oliver, 13, Penywern Road, Earls Court, S.W.5. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (14th and 28th March) at 127 Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. Secretary: 54, Ashdale House Seven Sisters Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

LEYTON Branch meets Mondays 8.0 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10. Lectures and Discussions held 2nd and 4th Monday in each month. Secretary, D. Russell, c/o H.O., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 13th and 27th March, George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Walkden, Worsley, Near Manchester.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road, Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (9 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

at

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

on

FRIDAY, SATURDAY and SUNDAY

MARCH 30th, 31st and APRIL 1st.

Commencing each day at 11 a.m.

CONFERENCE DANCE

at

CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.1

on

SATURDAY, 31st MARCH

Tickets 3s.

Refreshments available.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 620 Vol. 52 April, 1956

On Working Yourself Out of Your Job

STALIN THE GOD AND
STALIN THE GANGSTER

ANARCHIST REFORMISM

THE FABIANS, BERNSTEIN
AND REVISIONISM

ASPECTS OF MARXISM

WHAT HOLDS US BACK?

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

4

ONE OF THE COMPANIES that put its workers on short-time is the Standard Motor Co. at its Coventry factories; where, out of 11,000 men, 250 a day were stood off on a rota system. The men did not like this and Mr. W. Warman, chairman of the Joint Shop Stewards' Committee suggested a different solution:

"We do not accept short-time working. Production should be cut by a shorter working week and reduced efficiency for the same pay. We increased production by working harder and now we should just not work so hard. We have been advocating a 36-hour week at Standards." (*Manchester Guardian* 5/3/56).

Mr. Warman's few, well-chosen words, had quite a lively reception, as doubtless he knew they would. For he not only suggested unreduced pay for reduced hours



but, what was far more provocative, he spoke against efficiency and in favour of not working so hard. And that simply isn't done.

As the immediate cause of short-time working is that there are tens of thousands of motor cars that have been made to be sold but are unsold, the idea of making fewer of them would seem to be sensible. And if the world were organised in a rational sort of way, who could quarrel with Mr. Warman's idea of the workers working fewer hours? And in such a world the last thing that could possibly occur would be a lowered standard of living. It is only in the world of today, this complicated bedlam, that people think it quite natural that workers who have produced *more* should be punished by consuming *less*.

But as we do live in this mad world of Capitalism Mr. Warman's proposal was not accepted. As a matter of fact it was not really timely advice.

For obviously the time to act on such lines would be *before* output had been

pushed up, not after the employers had found that they could not sell cars and wanted to stand men off. As a correspondent in the *Daily Herald*, Mr. Maurice Fagence, pointed out, with more than 80,000 unsold cars in the stockpiles (of the manufacturers as a whole) "a strike at the present time cannot help the workers." (*Daily Herald*, 5/3/56.)

But during recent years too many workers have been thinking more about getting overtime pay for excess hours of work than of trying to get higher pay for the normal hours of work. It is true that since 1939 there has been a fairly general reduction of normal hours from 47 or 48 hours a week to 44 hours. But instead of putting in fewer hours the average time actually worked each week is longer now than it was before the war. For men workers the average has gone up from 47.7 hours in 1938 to 48.9 hours in 1955. This chasing after overtime cannot be regarded as a sound policy for workers to adopt. But even if policy had been more far-sighted it would not have kept the workers out of trouble. Whatever the workers do under Capitalism difficulties face them and troubles arise. If they back productivity schemes, work hard and produce more they may find themselves sooner or later on short-time or out of work. But if they reduce efficiency and work less hard they may find themselves in the same fix because the firm they work for will dismiss them or may find itself bankrupt if other, more efficient, firms have been able to capture the market.

And if they choose the middle way and work at a moderate pace, neither too fast nor too slow, they may still find themselves out of work. In 1952, when a textile slump hit producers in most parts of the world, over

150,000 textile workers in this country suddenly found themselves out-of-work and forced to live on unemployment pay. Many had to find jobs in other industries. Nobody suggested that they had increased their productivity unduly, in fact they were still being preached at for not having done so. And the wave of unemployment that hit them likewise hit textile industries of varying degrees of efficiency in U.S.A., Japan, and elsewhere.

By real working class unity, of all workers, in all trades, in all countries, some effective restraint could be imposed on the efforts of employers everywhere to increase the intensity of work. But with the outlook of the workers as it is at present this is not going to happen either. Unfortunately what most workers in most countries are now doing is backing up their employers and their governments to capture trade from the Capitalists in other countries. This short-sighted policy is encouraged by most of the workers' industrial and political leaders, though it should be obvious that the workers of all countries would be in a stronger position against their employers if they all stood together and refused to be drawn into work harder campaigns designed to capture markets from other countries.

When all is said and done, even if all the workers stood unitedly together to get as much as they can out of Capitalism, what a very foolish thing they would still be doing. The only sensible thing for workers to do is to get together for something much more worth while, the establishment of Socialism. Then there would be no problem of working yourself out of a job, only the problem of producing as much of everything as people wanted. H.

THE FABIANs, BERNSTEIN AND REVISIONISM

(Continued from the February "Socialist Standard")

THE controversy between Askew and Bax over Bernstein's membership of the German Social Democratic Party, was concluded in the July and August numbers of the *Social Democrat*.

Askew's contribution to the July number contended that Bax had not shown that Bernstein had defended "almost every abuse of Capitalism," and, to offset this charge, he pointed out that Bernstein was actually at that time advocating "the use of that extremely conservative weapon known as the general strike" in opposition to the great bulk of the German party. He then goes on:

"Of course, I may point out, what Kautsky has already pointed out in his book against Bernstein, what was the distinguishing feature of Bernstein's standpoint was the absence of any definite standpoint. You had criticism of the party programme, etc., but what Bernstein's own standpoint was it was impossible to say. Now, we may think what we may of Bernstein for having published his ideas in this way; we may think he was inconsistent in staying in the party; but owing to the very indefiniteness of his ideas, we cannot condemn them without at the same time condemning criticism itself."

This is a strange argument of Askew's. The German Party claimed to be Marxist and organised for the establishment of Socialism. Bernstein was opposed to the basic Marxian outlook and supported anti-Socialist proposals, some of which we have already referred to. Yet because his views were "indefinite" (they were certainly definitely anti-Socialist) Askew holds that he should not be excluded from the German party. However, there is this much to be said for Askew's views. The German

Party supported such a hotch-potch of reformism that they had difficulty in making a case against Bernstein that would not react against the bulk of their own members.

Askew then argues that as nobody took the trouble to go through Bernstein's articles and draw attention to the nature of his actions, it was no use "talking at random in the English party Press when what was required was an explanation in the German party Press." Then Askew twits Bax with himself being guilty of the mendacity with which he charges Bernstein. In support of this he charges Bax with having misquoted Bebel's statements in his book on the Woman question. Bax had quoted Bebel in support of his own view that Feminism, as such is not, and never has been, a necessary part of Socialism. Askew makes a long quotation from p. 7 of the 30th edition of Bebel's "Woman." In the extract Bebel states that the Democratic Parties agree that women should have equal treatment, and their emancipation from all dependence and oppression, on account of Socialist principles. But this agreement cannot be said for the manner in which the aim is to be achieved. As soon as one "enters on the description of the institutions of the future, a wide field is opened out for speculation." He then goes on that what is laid down in this book are the personal views of the author for which he alone is responsible.

There is then an attack on Bax's attitude to the M.C. of H. and Askew says that Bax's views on the subject are difficult to distinguish from Bernstein's, and, in

fact, he was told by a member of the Swiss party that:

"Large numbers of the comrades were firmly convinced that Bax was a Bernsteinianer... now, as Kautsky explained, no one has dreamed of making acceptance of the materialist conception of history a condition of party membership; then, neither, so far as I know, has anyone hitherto seriously proposed to make a limitation of the right of free criticism in the sense proposed by Bax, but, if we are to accept Bax's test that criticism of fundamentals is to be forbidden, the case is altered. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

Askew takes up Bax's contention that criticism of the party programme was permissible but criticism of the ultimate foundation on which the party rests, its basal object, was not permissible. Askew then argued that "ultimate foundation" and "basal object" were not the same thing; that the "Socialisation of the means of production" was the basal object, and the ultimate foundation consisted of the theory of surplus value and the materialist conception of history. He then quotes Kautsky as writing that of the two the materialist conception of history "is become the more fundamental. With it stands or falls Marxism, i.e., the highest point at which the Socialist theory has yet arrived." Askew adds that, while this is a personal opinion, a very large majority of the members of the party would agree with it, and if a rule is made that fundamentals must not be criticised it would have unfortunate results.

There is a footnote to one of the pages of Askew's contribution in which he twits Bax with his membership of a Liberal Club, remarking that he "finds it inconsistent with his (Bax's) hatred of Liberalism to remain a member of a Club which makes it a condition of membership that a member should recognise the principles of the Liberal Party—a Club recognised, almost more than the Reform, as the headquarters of the party."

We will give Askew's concluding paragraph in full as it summarises his outlook, and what he expects.

"Finally, the German party has better things to do than to consider if, when members declare their agreement with the main principles of the party programme, they do so with their tongue in their cheek or not. As long as any individual member proves loyal in the practice, the German party are not prepared to limit the right of free criticism, which they consider is the very breath of life to the party, because they

do not agree to all that he says. 'Idealist' Marxists or synthetic historians may attach great importance to rigidity of doctrine; we materialists know that the facts of life decide. Thus we do not get into a fuss every time the class war is called in question; we know that the class war, being inherent in the present order of society, will soon assert itself again, even where it seems to be temporarily eclipsed. And the same applies to the 'final aim' of Socialism. The proletariat as a whole must, in its own interests, demand the socialisation of the means of production, etc. Of course you get backwaters in this as in all progress, and you find the English trade unions, having got to a certain pitch, stopping there. But even this seems to me to confirm the materialist conception of history. As long as the Continental workers were in the eyes of the British workmen in a much inferior position to themselves, the latter could hardly believe in the possibility of their own emancipation. They would, no doubt, say to themselves, 'Beyond a certain extent we cannot at present improve our position.' That may be right or wrong, but I cannot help feeling, and this feeling was strengthened by the arguments of the British delegation at the recent Textile Workers' Congress, that it had its influence on the English trade unionists. Taken with the fact that English employers, owing to their position in the world, were able, and not unnaturally willing, to make concessions in the interests of peace from time to time, that the 'suffrage' was practically a gift at a time when no urgent demand had arisen for it, I think we have ground to assume that the peculiar historical conditions of the British trade unionist explains the weakness of his class consciousness. But the loss of a favoured position, or what he imagines is a favoured position, compared with his Continental brothers, will do more than all the preaching in the world to make the British working man Socialist. When that comes, we need not fear the heresy of a Bernstein any more than that of a Bax. We can be tolerant of them just as we should be tolerant of those who deny the theory of gravity."

It will be noticed that there are no doubts here about whether "Final Truth" has been attained. Askew makes positive statements about the accuracy of the materialist conception of history, the class war and class-consciousness, as well as his satisfaction with the eventual outcome of trade union agitation, in spite of set-backs. He also takes for granted that Bernstein and his like will be proved wrong. But he skates over the confusion that would come to a party honeycombed with people like Bernstein.

GILMAC.

(To be continued)

ASPECTS OF MARXISM

Some Critics Criticised

CRITICS of Marx rarely agree as to actually what they disagree about in respect of his doctrines. Take for example two recent critics J. Plamanatz, Fellow of Nuffield College and R. N. Carew Hunt. J. Plamanatz in his book "German Marxism and Russian Communism," does not even grant historical materialism the status of an hypothesis let alone a theory of social development. (pp 172/3.) Although unmindful of this he tells us later, "historical materialism is an hypothesis much better forgotten while those who support it have nothing more to say in its favour than what the Marxists have said."

On the other hand R. N. Carew Hunt in his work "The Theory and Practise of Communism" says (p. 42). "The economic factor for all social institutions and particularly for their historical development has exercised a profound influence and all modern writers are indebted to him (Marx) even if they do not know it." He adds, "any return to pre-Marxist social theory is impossible."

There is also a difference of emphasis in their respective evaluation of Marxian economics. Thus J. Plamanatz (p. 113), same book, says "Marx's analysis of Capitalism, though seldom free from obscurity sometimes illogical and often mistaken is nevertheless impressive," on the other hand, R. N. Carew Hunt in "The Theory and Practise of Communism" (p. 61), quotes with apparent approval Keynes's dictum, "Capital is an obsolete text book... not only scientifically erroneous but without interest or application for the modern world."

So among critics of Marx, "yer pays yer money and yer takes yer choice," a choice so wide and varied as to constitute an embarrassment rather than an exercise of the critical faculties. Thus for the price of one book you may gather that Marx was a mental, even if mistaken, giant. Another book may present him as a sort of intellectual pigmy—on stilts. You can also learn that he was a kind of humanitarian watchdog or from an opposite angle that he is the "big bad wolf" of the class struggle

concept. He has even been called the father of sociology, a title which R. N. Carew Hunt says he well deserves. On the other hand he has been regarded by many acid critics, of whom J. Plamanatz might be included, as a victim of Hegelian dyspepsia which kept repeating all through his writings. If the reader has perused a number of books criticising Marx and is a little confused and dissatisfied then he can try asking the publishers for his money back or take to reading Marx himself. What a pity Marx could not, in reply to "What did Marx really mean, by the critics" have penned, "What do the critics really mean by Marx."

After this one might be faintly surprised to learn that R. N. Carew Hunt regards "Capital" as a very great book and one of the most important ever written (p. 62). As to why it is a great book the author is vagueness itself. Mr. Carew Hunt cannot, however, praise without faint damns. Marx, it seemed, on his intellectual voyage did not quite know where he was going, consequently he lost his bearings and by accident discovered something. Just like Columbus who, having lost his route to India, chanced upon the New World. Mr. Carew Hunt also offers a curious clue as to why he thinks "Capital" is a very great book. He quotes Mr. Edmund Wilson to the effect that the principles of "capital" "are derived solely from the laws of human selfishness which are as unfailing as the laws of gravitation."

This is nonsense. How could Marx hold that man in changing the world change themselves and yet believe at the same time in a fixed pattern of human behaviour based on laws of human selfishness expressed as self interest? Indeed for Marx individual motives whether selfish or otherwise, are too complex and obscure even for the individual himself to adequately understand; too fluctuating and tending to cancel each other out, to offer a reliable index to social change. Only the resultant effect of the behaviour of individuals under given objective conditions can be studied and correlated with key factors of the social environment in order to reveal the historical significance of human activity. Even to say that individuals have an interest in self-preservation does not mean a biological adaption to "Nature red in tooth and claw" or a series of sudden impulses and desires actuated by urgent immediacy. Like other interests, self-preservation operates through a complex, socially mediated environment. While it may serve to make individuals highly responsive to social pressures and changes it cannot explain the historically specific activities and interests of men. The key to understanding such activities and interests is not to be located in fixations like self-preservation or self interest but in the social structure and class character of the society in which men live.

The concept of self interest as a social dynamic belongs not to Marx but Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism which sought to give a corporate expression for private interests and pleasure in the maxim of "The greatest happiness of the greatest number." Such a view served, however, as an apology for Capitalist society because it disregarded the fact that Capitalism was a system based on exploitation and chose to believe that there was some common utility to which all human interests and welfare could be equated and that the existing social relations are the most advantageous and commonly useful to all.

Utilitarianism may be said to be the official social theory of bourgeois society. Its content is essentially anti-social. Its view is an atomistic one. While individuals may jostle with each other in the mutually advan-

tageous hurly-burly of every day life they nevertheless remain self-sufficient units, indivisible and impenetrable. As Marx pointed out, on this theory the egotistic individual is the abstract ideal of bourgeois society. It was John Stuart Mill who gave Utilitarianism an extra coat of humanitarian gloss. While the Fabians with one or two characteristic touches incorporated it into their political philosophy. It has also passed into current economic culture where, according to certain marginal productivity economists, a "natural law" tends to give capital what capital creates, and to labour what labour creates. So every unit of production, we are assured, exploits every other unit and a la Bentham a good time is had by all.

Such a theory of individualism fails to see the unbreakable social links which bind man to man. Just as it failed to see that it was the complex myriad inter-relationships of the division of labour which gave individuals their status and privilege, and not their own unaided merit. Marx himself did not deny the role of the individual in society. What he denied was the alleged "rights of individuals" as expressed in a social philosophy. He revealed that Capitalism was a society which brought about a social alienation but, less than any other man, would he have attributed this to some inflexible behaviour, in the form of self-interest as universal and pervasive as the law of gravitation. Indeed, it was Marx's peculiar contribution to our intellectual inheritance to reveal this alienation as the outcome of the separation of the vast majority from their instruments of production, and the conversion of their productive energies into a commodity. The anti-social consequences of Capitalist society, where the law of value constitutes the real planning authority, has its font, not in the hearts and minds of men, but in the character of the social organisation in which they live.

For Marx the future of man pointed, not to a mythical harmony established by the competitive free play of self interest, but to the social control of all those agencies necessary for man's well being. Class divided society, Marx thought, impoverished the real content of individuality, only Socialised humanity, he believed, would change the form and enrich the nature of human personality and make it a social value accessible to all. Nor, as is alleged, do Marxists explain specific ideas as facile rationalisations of an underlying motive of self interest. It recognises ideas as powerful agencies through which men conduct their social struggles, and in which they often sincerely believe. Marxists do not underestimate the role of ideas in history. They refuse, however, to accept ideas at their face value. Ideas, they contend, can only be significantly understood by revealing their integral connection with men's interests and needs. That is why historical ideas cannot be severed from material interests. Historical materialism thus explains, better than any other theory, why in the course of history some ideas have succeeded and others failed. Why some have been accepted and others rejected. For Marxists, ideas are not powers within themselves; they only become effective as instruments of social change when they are tied to powerful historic class needs. Behind the conflict of social ideals there is always a conflict of group economic interests.

Men have many interests, none of which can be isolated from each other, but if we want to know which interest has predominated in the course of history, then analysis shows it is class economic interests which have been crucial in modifying or revolutionising the social situation.

History, Marxists claim, is not the story of individuals with fixed pattern behaviours, but the record of the economic conflict of social classes and, with it, the rise of some and decline of others. Because an individual cannot think or act on his own behalf it is only in and through these social classes that his social outlook, traditions, and allegiances, are moulded. From this it follows that a dominant social group will systematise its ideas and attitudes in seeking to preserve the social situation which serves their needs. Just as other groups in accordance with their aims and interests will seek to modify, or radically alter, existing conditions. Each ruling group proclaims, however, that it speaks, not for itself but on behalf of the community.

Social classes have no reference to an abstract economic man pursuing the path of self interest, but grew out of the development of socially organised production. If the investigation of history starts with men's needs it can be shown that these needs are socially produced and therefore socially mediated. From these needs there develops the sub-division of labour which in turn brings about different and various vocational activities and productive functions. It is from this historical productive structure that individuals acquired status and privilege, which crystallised into social classes.

Because human history is social history the motives of the single "self" are never determining factors in social development. Since the passing of primitive society history has been class history and the behaviour of individuals, class conditioned. Moreover, men are born into a set of class relations independent of their individual wills, i.e., as master or slave, lord or serf, Capitalist or wage worker, which limit their scope and action. The scope and action of members of a class are even more significantly limited by the overall, and constant pressure, of their existing needs resulting from economic condi-

tions, the outcome of which results in a common purpose and activity. Because the common economic activity which members of a class engage in produces an aggregate effect, it does not follow that such activity is reducible to the individual behaviour of members of that class. The motives actuating an individual might not be primarily economic, but his consideration and conduct are moulded by the interests of the group to which he belongs, and without whose support little could be effected. Class interests and the opposition between class interests centre around the ownership of the productive resources.

Because variations in individual motives are compensated for in any large aggregate activity, it produces a net effect different from the anticipated end result of each individual action. By correlating this average behaviour with crucial factors in a given social environment we are able to give a significant account of the society in which we live.

Marx never sought to make the individual the sole responsible agent for the society of which he is a part. This did not prevent him from protesting against the anti-social consequences of the class ownership of the productive resources and the anti-social nature of the class behaviour associated with it. While he never held the Rousseau belief which saw man as an essentially noble animal he never wavered from the view that the vast majority were capable of transforming the dehumanised character of extant society into something truly human. Far from believing in an invariant pattern of human behaviour, he proclaimed, "all history is a modification of human nature." Mr. Carew Hunt's attempt to foist on Marx the notion of an abstract economic man is laughable. He is typical of a long line of critics who have not read Marx so much as to have read what others have read into him.

E.W.

WHAT HOLDS US BACK ?

Ashton-in-Makerfield,
LANCS.

Dear Comrades,

Dare I venture as an ex-member to voice a point of view on the social question? Whilst it is understood that the Socialist movement in this country as represented by the S.P.G.B. deserves all the praise for all that voluntary work which the loyal members as writers and speakers have done for over 50 years with the idea of trying to enlighten the minds of the members of the "working class" towards an understanding of Socialism as a means to the solution of the social problems which affect the working class, may I suggest since it is common knowledge to the members of the S.P.G.B. that the time has come, which calls for a little mental stock-taking to ascertain or try to explain away to their own satisfaction why the Socialist message which has been put over to your London audiences over a period of years hasn't rung any bell in the minds of the workers. Since the Socialist movement doesn't make any headway in an increase in membership it is obvious some explanation is needed.

Should Socialists discuss the issue and give a united decision on it? Can I suggest some material phenomena for such discussion? "Does Capitalism in this develop-

ing period, which enables the working class as a whole to maintain a standard of living with the aid of its Trade Unions which they regard as satisfactory, operate as a factor in the workers contentment with Capitalism?" So long as Capitalism can give the workers their weekly pay packet isn't that all the workers want? Do Socialists look on Socialism as a practical proposition, in the present developing Capitalism? or do they regard Socialism as a practical necessity only when Capitalism has produced the high productive social forces, which fetter production and which in turn puts millions of workers out of work? Is it under those material conditions which Socialists can expect the workers to become interested in the Socialist solution? If these points explain why the Socialist message, which is put over at present doesn't ring any bell in the minds of the workers, what should be the Socialist policy under the present conditions?

Since the Socialist movement makes the sound and correct moral indictment against our present social system, and since the present social system is kept in existence because it is supported and upheld by the majority of the workers, cannot the same indictment be made against the workers for their mental stupid blind support?

Hasn't the time come when Socialists should cease to nurse the workers, since the ideas, motives, and general moral conduct is as much in question as the known Capitalists defenders? Has the Socialist movement in our present developing Capitalism anything to lose by dealing with the workers Capitalistic ideology, the sordid ideas, and motives and general conduct? Should the "S.S." be used more to deal with Henry Dubb's sordid ideas, motives and conduct? Is it true such ideas and motives and conduct act as a stumbling block in the path to acquire social ideas and correct motives, and right moral conduct? Such a policy would have a tendency to attract the notice of the worker readers of the "S.S." and would probably bring in correspondence. This is what the Editorial Committee want so it would give them the further chance to give Henry the mental bumping he deserves. At least that can be done in the "S.S." if not on the stump.

Haven't Socialists enough evidence to support their moral indictment against the workers sordid ideas, etc.? The present writer gives three cases as examples of such ideas and behaviour patterns. The following conversation between two workers as partners in a freight business, I overheard their conversation as I stood against their loaded fruit lorry in Covent Garden some few years ago. One said to the other, "give it the bloody juice never mind the fine, get there, we'll see to the fine afterwards." The second case. A workmate I worked with a few years ago told me with great glee on his face about the smartness of his own wife in her dealings with the Yanks during the war. Apparently she worked in a canteen which supplied whisky to the Yanks. The latter are known to be good natured re treating any one to a drink. Such was the case with the woman in question, but instead of drinking the whisky she put it in a jug or a bottle which was behind the bar and as time passed it accumulated and when the time came that they ran short of whisky, she brought it out and sold the Yanks their own whisky back to them at a handsome profit. My work pal got a great kick out of his moral story. Third case. In spite of overwhelming evidence to the support of the Socialist truth that all workers have material interests in common to defend, they allow themselves to be used as cannon fodder to wage war against other workers on behalf of their exploiters when war breaks out. The said workers political and economic ignorance shows up their wrong ideas, motives and conduct and calls for a moral indictment because of the anti-social nature. Is it a part of the Socialist case to have to try and defend such behaviour on the old fallacious Blatchfords grounds of defence of the bottom dog; the not guilty argument, because the workers are alleged to be victims of their Capitalist environment?

The workers are in the same environment as the Socialist and can get the correct ideas, motives and conduct, if they weren't too mentally lazy, to try to get them. The choice is there, but being mentally lazy, they prefer to get the wrong ideas. The Socialist movement hasn't anything to lose by telling the workers some home truths, and let them see what Dubb's you think they are. Charge the Henry Dubb's as political blacklegs or scabs, of being on the wrong side of the political fence and that they ought to be sent to Coventry.

The more they squirm, more is the success of the moral indictment.

I remain, yours truly,
(signed) EDWARD LITTLER.

REPLY

Before coming to specific questions our correspondent gives his description of the situation that leads him to raise them. This situation, in his view, is that Socialist propaganda "hasn't rung any bell in the minds of the workers," and again, "The Socialist movement doesn't make any headway." This is not a correct assessment. Though the Socialist movement is small and progress slow it is not correct that no progress is made. The membership of the S.P.G.B. is about three times what it was 30 years ago. The correct statement of the problem should therefore be, why is progress so slow?

It is partly answered by recalling that the founders of the S.P.G.B. were at the outset convinced that the work would be hard and progress slow; that it may have been even slower than some of them thought only indicates some under-estimation of the forces at work against us.

Our correspondent's next point is that under present conditions the workers are satisfied with their standard of living, and receiving their weekly pay packet is all they want. We do not agree with this statement and can see abundant evidence that it is not true. If it were true the workers would not, as in fact they do, repeatedly claim higher real wages and be met with refusals from the employers and appeals from the Government not to make and press such claims. Again, if it were true that that is all the workers want, they would not trouble themselves about the electoral programmes of the Tory, Labour, Liberal and other parties promising them something more. They would not trouble to vote. The fact that the great majority of them do vote and do put Governments in and out is evidence that they are not satisfied merely to receive their weekly pay packet.

Then our correspondent asks if the attitude of the workers towards Socialism will not be different when the time comes that "Capitalism has produced the high productive social forces which fetter production, which in turn puts millions of workers out of work." The question itself is in error, and the answer does not rest on speculation about what may happen in the future. It has all happened long ago and many times. Capitalism has long been a fetter on production and for a century and a half has periodically seen "normal" unemployment rocket up to depression levels. But during depression times the number of workers moved to become interested in Socialism was not materially different from the number who became interested in Socialism in "boom" times. The great majority of the millions of workers unemployed in the 19th century depressions or the depressions between the wars did not interest themselves in Socialism. They went instead into campaigns for unemployment doles, for Government-provided work schemes, for tariff reform, or free trade, or Nationalisation and the rest of the reformist illusions, or they went on hunger marches. Hunger without understanding makes rebels and reformists, not Socialists, and the membership of the S.P.G.B. in those depression times was smaller than it is now under "full employment."

Continuing his argument our correspondent suggests that Socialists should make the same indictment against the workers for their "stupid, blind support" of Capitalism as they do against Capitalism; cease to "nurse" the workers and instead attack their Capitalist ideas and behaviour.

This criticism surprises us because in long years of propaganda the S.P.G.B. has so often been criticised for doing the very thing our correspondent says we do not

do. We have often been taken to task by critics on the alleged ground that S.P.G.B. writers and speakers constantly allow their impatience to express itself in exasperated condemnation of the non-Socialist workers.

The important point, however, is that the aim of Socialist propaganda must always be to get non-Socialists to understand and agree with our point of view; harping on their "stupidity," etc., is hardly likely to further that aim. It is also not true that the working class are stupid or, in the main, anti-social in their behaviour. Blind to their own interests, yes; lacking an understanding of and what will and what will not further their interest, but this is not stupidity. And in spite of those individuals whose reaction to Capitalism is to fight ruthlessly for their own hand without regard to others, the great majority of workers show a regard for their fellow workers, at least those with whom they are closely associated, and a sense of social responsibility that should rather surprise us in view of the pres-

sure of the Capitalist, anti-social environment.

We repeat, therefore, that what the working class lacks is knowledge of the Socialist case and our correspondent has not shown that there is some easier and quicker way of providing it than the way followed by the S.P.G.B.

In conclusion we cannot omit to point out to our correspondent and to others who have allowed slow progress to dishearten them, that progress would be that much quicker if all who understand and want Socialism joined in the task of winning over the great army of the unconverted, instead of progressively becoming disheartened and falling out. If all those who have fallen out had remained in the movement what a strong movement for Socialism we would have now. The only way, and the certain one, to succeed, is to keep at it.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE.

RICHARD III

AN introduction to Shakespeare through the film is a direct contrast to the poverty-stricken method taught in the Secondary Modern Schools. There we were told to like him because his works are classics. Instead we learned to hate him because of the laborious memorising of long passages of meaningless verse. Consequently the majority of working-men and women are indifferent to him.

With the advent of the film, that mallet of knowledge smashes the inverted bowl of ignorance.

Richard III, showing at Leicester Square, breaks down the barrier of the artificiality of the stage where the actors shout at the top of their voices in a most unnatural manner. This technique makes it possible for Sir Laurence Olivier to discourse as if he stood at one's side. Briefly, the plot deals with the diabolical schemes of the then Richard, Duke of Gloucester, to become king. He expounded his attitude in the opening verse:

"... I am determined to prove a villain
And hate the idle pleasures of these days.
Plots have I laid, inductions dangerous,
By drunken prophecies, libels and dreams,
To set my brother Clarence and the King
In deadly hate the one against the other..."

Written with class consciousness one might say:

"... We are determined to preserve the capitalist system,
And to hate the idle pleasures of the workers.
Plots have we laid, inductions dangerous,
By calculated religious, national and racial prejudice.
Brain-washing and vice anon,
In deadly hate set the workers physically and mentally
Within and without nations until the world itself;
At each others throats..."

Or perhaps as Shakespeare himself would have applied his analysis to the self-preservation policies of Russian dictators and others.

That is the point about Shakespeare; he deals with human relationships within the private property system and clothes them with beautiful words and profound phrases. They are shrewd observations and will remain eternal. In a Socialist society they will prove a vivid insight into the minds of men and women governed by the private property complex.

The rest of the story deals with the carrying out of the power-seeking schemes, the killing of the king's

brother, the princes of the Tower and others. The planting of fifth columnists in the London crowd, hailing him king. A ruse not forgotten by the politicians of the present day nor by their verbal supporters, the journalists and the "camera-never-lies" friends.

Eventually he meets his downfall at the battle of Bosworth, calling out with great effect, "My kingdom for a horse!"

The film is swift-moving and excellently coloured in conjunction with the wide screen process.

There are some exquisite scenes particularly the snow-covered landscape when the princes were being brought to London.

One cannot help mentioning Olivier because his fine acting dominates the film. The nearest to him, John Gielgud, was unfortunately given a minor role. The other actors, although good, still had that faint air of staginess, that is, a slight wooden demeanour whilst awaiting their cue.

Clare Bloom played wonderfully the difficult part of being consumed with grief as Lady Anne. The diction as a whole is clear. Later when one reads the play the hitherto dead words spring into life, voices of the actors within the mind speak their parts. Having reached that state one becomes an addict.

This film is an exhilarating change from the usual trough of films dealing with blood and thunder and sordid glory.

WILLIAM FALCONER.

Correction

"ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR PAY?"

In the last paragraph of the above article in the March issue the word "bad" appeared instead of "had." The last sentence should therefore have read: "The one thing that cannot be had is to impose on the Capitalist jungle some socially acceptable and satisfying wage policy."

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

APRIL



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

STALIN THE GOD AND STALIN THE GANGSTER

SO the Stalin legend is ended, struck down by the hands that built it up. Three years after his death the Communist Party leaders of all nationalities who fawned on him and grovelled at his feet in his lifetime, and who slobbered hysterically at his funeral, vie with each other to speak ill of their dead hero. They now make charges that he was cowardly, conceited, ignorant and stupid, cunning and brutal, and his supposedly benevolent guidance of his admiring and loving people nothing but a betrayal of Communist ideals, a bestial reign of terror under which no voice of protest could be heard and no man of integrity was safe against arbitrary execution.

One thing we must, however, not forget. If the faction that wants to belittle Stalin carries the day we may expect the anti-Stalin campaign to be as richly ornamented with new lies as was the old campaign to build up the Stalin myth. History will be re-written again with no more regard for truth.

For the venal and sycophantic second-line leaders it is a cruel dilemma. While the dictator lived the drill was simple. Since he was all-wise, when he turned they all turned; and fell over each other to praise his every tortuous twist of policy. But, as has happened throughout history, the dictator's death launches his immediate circle into a bloody struggle for power, and the minor leaders and their followers suddenly have to make up their own minds which faction to support. So the British Com-

munist are now anxiously disputing about the line they ought to follow. This is the eventual fate of all organizations built up on leader-worship and Socialists can view their agonies with equanimity. The Communist Party has never been a force for Socialism and its disruption could only be a gain to the working class.

The way they reported the outbreak of the latest campaign against the dead Stalin is characteristic of their behaviour through the years of his rule. They always kept up the fiction that Russia, which they lyngly described as Socialist, was freely open to reporters and visit-



ing delegations to see what they liked and tell what they saw. Yet in the issue of the *Daily Worker* of 17 March, 1956, when they summarised two agency reports of the string of charges levelled at Stalin by Krushchov at the conference of the Russian Communist Party, they gave it non-committally under the heading "Stalin: A Strange Story," and had to admit that "up to the time of going to press, no confirmation had been received of either story from the *Daily Worker* correspondent in Moscow, or from any Soviet newsagency." But the speech was delivered as long ago as 25th February! Why did not the correspondent report it? In the first place it was delivered at a "private session." Why private? Why did the self-styled "democratic" Russian Communist Party exclude from its conference its British Communist brothers? And as other correspondents soon heard about the speech why did not the *Daily Worker* correspondent send on what was by then common talk in Moscow? Again what was the correspondent doing in all the years of Stalin's life never to have reported the truth about his rule?

From one angle the British Communists' behaviour is more excusable than that of the non-Communists who

visited Russia and sent back glowing reports that now appear as grossly misleading. For, after all, implicit obedience to the Leader was the Communist Party's one and only article of faith. No such excuse can be made for the other visitors to Russia, including Bernard Shaw. Many of them smothered the truth for other reasons, above all out of ignorance: not understanding Socialism they needed no persuading that the monstrous State Capitalism of Russia was its opposite, Socialism.

Of course the open defenders of Capitalism will rejoice at the demolition of the Stalin legend and will use it to besmirch Socialism, but Socialists will not be dismayed. This is not a new obstacle to Socialist propaganda but one that Socialists have had to deal with throughout the years of pretence about Russia under the

Communists. The harm to the Socialist movement was done at the beginning when Communists first put over the lie that the Russian regime is Socialism. And though the Labour Party will also now use the issue to discredit the Communist Party let it not be forgotten that many of the leaders of the Labour Party in the period since the Communist dictatorship was set up have also given their support to the basic falsehood of Socialism in Russia.

From now on it will become more and more obvious how right the S.P.G.B. was to see in the Communist seizure of power, not the birth of Socialism but the unfettering of the development of Capitalism in Russia. This was true when Stalin was alive and honoured and is still true now that he is dead and dishonoured.

ORWELL IN LIMBO

"OBSERVE... some lines of an institution which, in its original, might have been tolerable; but these half erased, and the rest wholly blurred and blotted by corruptions." Thus the king of Brobdingnag to Gulliver; thus one's thoughts ran, watching the Associated British Studios' film of 1984.

The credits describe it as "freely adapted" from George Orwell's novel. Some alterations were to be expected, and the minor ones obviously have been made with a view to the American market. Goldstein and O'Brien have become Calador and O'Connor, the dollar currency of Britain in 1984 is converted back to sterling, and two of the leading actors are American.

The last may not sound like an alteration but it certainly looks like one, since all the principals are remarkably miscast. Winston Smith is played by Mr. Edmund O'Brien, whose bulky physique speaks well for nutrition in 1984. Wearing a permanent puzzled look, Mr. O'Brien makes Winston an earnest, plodding chap, getting into trouble less through clear- than thick-headedness. Similarly, Miss Jan Sterling conveys languor instead of the sexy vitality from which Julia's rebellion arises, and thus never makes the point at all. O'Connor is played by Mr. Michael Redgrave, for all the world like a Frank Richards school-master; indeed, one half expects him to flourish a birch in the torture-chamber and cry "Upon my word, Bunter! I shall deal with you most severely for this insensate behaviour."

Still, some alterations were expected. What was not expected was the transformation of 1984 into a reaffirmation that Luv Conquers All. True, the ending is not happy in the usual sense: Winston and Julia are shot down, reaching out for each other, after finding their love unaltered (like Winston's weight) by the months of torture. The message remains, however. Brains can be washed, but not hearts; thought can be destroyed, but not Luv.

Orwell's is the best, most intelligent of the novels which have tried prognosticating what man will come to: far better, for example, than *Brave New World* or *Ape and Essence*, because it gives a more coherent account of human activity. Basically it is a throwing-up of hands: at the growth of central power and its obsessional wielding by the post-war Labour government, at Russia, at the new ground gained for mass suggestion, at the awful thought that this was where "State Socialism" would lead. For all its mistakenness, it has the virtue of being

a passionate protest against the regimentation of minds, and the film scarcely touches that. With its torture machines and plug-ugly police, it makes the 1984 regime dependent on physical suppression far more than inculcated acceptance.

Was Orwell mistaken, then? Of course he was. The assumptions on which he founded Big Brother's



utopia are that war can be kept up permanently to sustain a particular economy, and that power is an end in itself: neither can be justified. His book describes but never explains a class-divided society without a class struggle. Indeed, 1984 never comes to grips with the question of

the proles: they live squalidly, they loll in pubs, their culture is pornography and sentimental songs—but what do they do? Presumably they are productive workers, since Winstone, Julia and their Outer Party colleagues are government clerks—but what sort of production? Dictators and all other rulers rule just because of the labour and acquiescence of the great mass of productive workers, and that is the factor which Orwell discounted.

Most people have appeared unsure quite what to make of 1984 (except the Communists, who have danced with blind rage as if some cap had not only fitted but

fallen over their ears). A not-uncommon reaction has been that it may be mistaken but, well, it's a warning. So it is: a warning against prophetic works, especially when they are written with more indignation than understanding. All the same, Orwell's book is sincere and serious enough to have deserved better treatment from the film-makers. Television did much better by it.

The publicity for 1984 says with emphasis: "A Film of To-morrow to SHOCK you To-day." Fair enough.

R. COSTER.

THE PASSING SHOW

I hire 'em, I fire 'em

Under the 1948 treaty of "alliance" between Britain and Jordan, Britain is allowed to maintain air bases and troops in Jordan, and subsidises and trains the Arab Legion, which is the Jordan army and police force combined. The subsidy to the Arab Legion is paid not to the Jordan Government but direct to the Legion itself. Up to a short time ago the Arab Legion was commanded and controlled by Brigadier-General Glubb, who had the assistance of more than 70 British officers, some seconded from the British Army, but most on private contract with the Jordan Government. Under this set-up General Glubb "controlled a sum which amounted last year to two-thirds of Jordan's total national budget" (*The Observer*, 4/3/56). When it was pointed out that this meant that Jordan, with her coercive forces controlled—through Glubb and the British subsidy—by Britain, was little more than a British colony, the answer always came pat that Glubb had nothing to do with Britain; he was simply a "soldier of fortune," who was employed as a matter of private arrangement by King Hussein and the Jordan Government. But when, on 1st March, King Hussein acted on this assumption, and gave Glubb the sack, what a roar of anger went up from the British ruling class! In fact, under the old arrangement, Jordan was a quasi-colony of Britain; and the dismissal of Glubb was part of an attempt by the Jordanian ruling class to free itself from the tutelage of the British ruling class.

For better, for worse

But while the British ruling class was roaring with anger, our "progressives," our left-wing Labourites and Communists, were roaring with approval. The sacking of Glubb was seen as a successful episode in an anti-colonial struggle for liberation by the Jordan people instead of indicating merely a change of masters. But how progressive is it to be a "progressive?" For while the Arab Legion was controlled by Britain, Glubb saw to it that it was kept ready to defend the interests, strategic and commercial, of the British ruling class in the Middle East, in any possible struggle with anti-British powers. It was therefore the policy of Britain to keep the Legion out of any war with Israel. But now that the restraining influence of General Glubb has been removed, the chances of a war between Israel and Jordan, with all the attendant devastation and misery, have been much increased. As usual, the "progressives" in their pursuit of "immediate" policies and "day-to-day" objectives, have found themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea.

The things that are sacred

The House of Commons has now voted twice within a month to end hanging. An interesting sidelight on the first debate in February was the attitude of *The Times*. It was against the complete abolition which Mr. Silverman and his associates called for; and although it prides itself that its news columns are impartial, it saw fit (taking the report of the debate and the summary on the main news page together) to give 90 inches of space to the speeches of the hangman's supporters against only 30 inches to those of the abolitionists.

As for the second debate, in March, one cannot resist quoting part of the contribution made by Mr. Logan, the Labourite, who sits for the Scotland Division of Liverpool (*The Times*, 17/2/56).

"The Bill was the most fallacious and damnable thing affecting the liberty of the people that had been brought before the House of Commons. It gave a licence to kill without a penalty. It should not be allowed. . . . If members of the House valued their own lives, if they valued law and order, and if they wanted to protect the things that were sacred, in the name of God it was their duty to vote against the second reading."

Camel-swallowers, Inc.

But in spite of the impassioned arguments of Mr. Logan, the Bill was given a second reading. What is the Socialist attitude to it? It means that some 12 or 13 persons each year will, instead of being hanged, be put into prison for a greater or lesser number of years. But in the meantime the system of Capitalism, with its big wars, "small" wars, colonial wars, and "emergencies," continues to send thousands to their deaths every year. Mr. Silverman, the Labour M.P. for Nelson and Colne, said in the first debate (*The Times*, 17/2/56):

"Beyond all the arguments about deterrents and the state of the law, there must remain in their minds the fear that from time to time at eight or nine o'clock in the morning an innocent man would be taken out of his cell to have his neck broken."

But Mr. Silverman, and the other Parliamentary supporters of the Bill, were also supporters of the last war, when not one or two innocent men, but hundreds of thousands of innocent men—and women and children too—were shot or bombed to pieces. If Mr. Silverman is really concerned with preventing innocent people losing their lives, he would be wise to devote himself to the inauguration of Socialism, instead of the patching-up of Capitalism.

Fiddling the accounts

Figures are frequently published to demonstrate to the workers that the rate of surplus value is really very

low. For this purpose various shady devices are employed—for example, allowing for directors' fees, which are often a disguised form of surplus value, as part of the total expenditure along with wages and raw materials, before calculating the amount of profit which the workers have produced for their bosses. Another, and more important, dodge is to allow for payment of the various company taxes before reckoning up the surplus value. And it is true that if this is done, the amount of surplus value is brought down considerably. But this is simply a trick. To the worker, labouring part of the week to produce the equivalent of his wages, and for the rest of the week to produce surplus value for his boss, it is immaterial whether that part of the value of his work which is stolen from him goes to the individual Capitalist who happens to employ him or to the executive committee of the Capitalist class, which is the State. The Capitalist grumbles about his taxes, but he goes on paying them, because the burden of taxation can only be borne by a propertied class. The State must foot heavy bills for things like armaments. And for these the Capitalists must pay. But they pay for what they want themselves—armaments are not bought

in the interest of the working class; they are bought to enable the ruling class—that is the Capitalist class—to defend its property and its profits against the ruling class of other states. But though the Capitalists have to sacrifice part of their gains to preserve the rest, all of it—what they buy armaments with and what they keep—is surplus value, which the worker produces and is then deprived of.

Boloney, Mr. Masfield

On February 17th the Queen returned from a tour of Nigeria. To mark the event Mr. John Masfield, the Poet Laureate, composed the following verse:

*Lines for the Home-Coming of our Most
Gracious Sovereign Lady*

Chain upon chain, and prison within prison,
Man shuts his spirit into deeper night.
This Lady, home-returning, has brought light.
Upon a way long dark a star has risen.

Do you really think it has, Mr. Masfield?

It is sad to see a man of Mr. Masfield's talents reduced to writing rubbish because the upper class expects it of him.

ALWYN EDGAR.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

May Day. In order that members are well acquainted with the arrangements made for *Sunday, May 6th*, here is a brief resumé of the proposed activities in London, Glasgow, and Nottingham. In Hyde Park, the usual trolley will be set up by three o'clock, and speakers will take turns in running the propaganda. Members should note that it helps the meeting to start more promptly if it is well supported by members. The Trades Union processions will be taking place and it is being planned that our members sell literature along the route. The procession will lead to Trafalgar Square where other parties will be holding meetings. Therefore, apart from selling literature along the route, we need a good number of members to circulate among the crowds at Trafalgar Square with the literature. In view of the fact that Ealing Branch has circularised London Branches in an endeavour to greatly increase the SOCIALIST STANDARD sales for May, this is an additional appeal to help to achieve this aim. Will Comrades willing to assist, please contact (personally, or by letter), the Propaganda Committee at Head Office. The sooner we have a list of willing Comrades the sooner and better we can make arrangements.

Glasgow (City and Kelvingrove Branches) are holding their May Day Rally on the afternoon of May 6th at Queen's Park Recreation Ground and at St. Andrew's Halls, Berkeley Street, from 7.30 p.m. Several speakers will be on the platform.

Nottingham Branch are holding a Mass Rally in the Market Square on the same day (May 6th) at 3 p.m. Speakers: J. Garnham, J. Keys and F. Warlow.

London. At Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1, a Rally will be held after the propaganda meeting in Hyde Park. The meeting commences at 7.30 p.m., the title "POLITICAL MATURITY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM." Speakers: R. Coster and W. Read. Although every effort will be made to advertise this London meeting, as there are restrictions at the moment regarding printing, it is essential that members and sympathisers pass on the details of this meeting



as widely as possible, in order that we have a really good attendance. So please note the details and PASS THE WORD ALONG!

A Meeting was held at Conway Hall on Monday, March 12th. Comrades Bryan and May spoke on "Departing Empires—the Socialist attitude." Although the attendance at the meeting was small, mainly due, we feel sure to being unable to advertise as usual, the audience was very interested and good questions were put to the speakers.

There is good news from **Camberwell Branch** again. Apart from having kept open-air meetings going throughout the winter at East Street, Walworth, the branch has vigorously extended canvassing the SOCIALIST STANDARD. In the first two months of the year, as a result of one of the meeting stations being closed, the sales of the SOCIALIST STANDARD usually fall to eight dozen. For the two months this year, however, 22 dozen were sold in the same period. The Branch would like to assure the Ealing Branch Comrades of their enthusiastic and practical support for their proposed May drive to really put the SOCIALIST STANDARD into working-class hands on a large scale. The Branch is more than confident that in May they will more than double the average monthly

sale of 10 dozen copies, and maintain it at the highest possible level. Meetings are held each Wednesday at Camberwell Green at 8 p.m.

The Branch holds its meetings on Thursday at the "Artichoke," just past Camberwell Green, at 8 p.m. The room is comfortable. All are welcome.

Swansea Group, though having lost members through transference to another branch have kept the Party before the reading public by constant letters to the Press on various topics. One Member's letter was given prominence on the billposters of the *Swansea Voice*, the public being shocked with glaring head lines, i.e., *Swansea Man wants to do away with Money!*

Challenges have been issued to various organisations and including a reverend gentleman who conducts a class

on the "Art of Public Speaking." This expert, needless to say, refused to test his skill against a Socialist speaker. The Llanelly branch of the Conservative Party has also refused to debate with us.

Swansea hope to be able to hold more open-air meetings during the coming summer, and are in contact from Comrades from London with this in view.

Outdoor Meetings. With the arrival of spring, the number of outdoor meetings held will increase and details of the additional meetings are given under the list of outdoor meetings advertised in this issue. Make a note please and attend as many as possible—good support for meetings stimulates speakers, helps to sell more literature and so helps along the work of the Party which is to propagate SOCIALISM.

P. H.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," April, 1906)

WHAT IS CAPITAL?

THE Editor of the *Clarion* in replying to a correspondent, writes, "You evidently don't understand the subject at all. No Socialist ever talks about 'doing away' with capital."

An instance this, truly, of "the blind leading the blind!" To be consistent the *Clarion* should also maintain that no Socialist ever talks of abolishing Capitalism—for Capitalism obviously cannot end if capital does not cease to exist.

The Socialists of all countries are, however, decidedly agreed that capital must be abolished; and the only explanation of the *Clarion* editor's strange statement is that he lacks a knowledge of the economics of Socialism.

The matter turns upon the definition of capital itself, and apparently the *Clarion* holds the archaic view that capital is simply wealth which aids in the production of further wealth. This is no definition at all, for, as even Professor Marshall is compelled to admit, it is an inclined plane upon which no stable resting place is found until all accumulated wealth is included as capital.

Socialist economics gives a definite meaning to capital

as that part of wealth which is used as a means of obtaining an income from the labour of others; in short, as wealth used to obtain "profit." Modern economists have been compelled, in practice, to accept this definition under one form or other of words, in order to give any value at all to the term.

The object of the Socialist movement, therefore, is decidedly to abolish capital; to end the use of wealth as a means of extorting surplus-value from the working class. The absurdity of the *Clarion* position is obvious from the fact that any other than the Socialist definition of capital makes every navvy who owns a pickaxe, a capitalist!

The "doing away" with capital, however, no more means the abolition of the instruments of production than the abolition of Capitalism implies the doing away with mankind. Socialism ends the system of production for profit, and inaugurates production for social use; it necessarily does away with the use of the means of wealth production as capital, and turns them into social instruments for the good of the community.

Economics, however, was never the *Clarion's* strong point.

PROPERTY IN RUSSIA

FOR those readers who have not read "Soviet Millionaires" the above pamphlet should be quite enlightening. For those who have, it should be another gem to add to their collection on Capitalist Russia. Published by "Soviet News," 3, Rosary Gardens, S.W.7, in 1954, and priced 1d., it is obviously within the reach of all workers' pockets.

A 20-page pamphlet, split up into 12 short paragraphs, it is easy to read. It deals with most aspects of property in Russia and leaves one in no doubt that the economy is a Capitalist one. The following extracts should suffice the reader:—Page 4: "The right to own property in Soviet Socialist society is ensured by the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. and is protected by Law."

"The land, its mineral wealth, waters, forests, mills,

factories, mines, rail, water and air transport, banks, communications, large State organised agricultural enterprises (State farms, and the like), and also municipal enterprises and the bulk of the dwelling houses in the cities and industrialised localities, are State property in the U.S.S.R." Page 12: "Citizens are paid for their work either in the form of wages—at State enterprises and institutions; or in the form of a definite share of the income in kind and cash—in the collective farms and co-operatives." Just like here!

"In general, a Soviet citizen has the exclusive right to dispose of all property in the way he thinks fit. If he has a house of his own, he may live in it, rent it out to others, make a gift of it, sell it, mortgage it or use it for other transactions permitted by law."

If any of our readers are still in any doubt about

Russia being a Capitalist country, a little booklet written by J. Stalin, as a series of articles in 1906, entitled, "Anarchism Or Socialism," published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950 should clear up any illusions that our readers may have. It is well worth reading being from the horse's mouth as it were! And tells us what Stalin thought Socialism would be like. Whilst not necessarily agreeing with everything in this quote, the general tenor of it is enough to prove that Socialism does not exist in Russia; apart from the fact that Socialism, being a world-wide system, it could not exist there while the rest of the world is Capitalist. The following is an extract from pages 57—59:—

"There can be no doubt that future society will be built up on an entirely different basis.

"Future society will be Socialist society. This means, primarily, that there will be no classes in that society; there will be neither capitalists, nor proletarians and, consequently, there will be no exploitation. In that society there will be only workers engaged in collective labour.

"Future society will be Socialist society. This also means that with the abolition of exploitation, commodity production and buying and selling will also be abolished and, therefore, there will be no room for buyers and sellers

of labour power, for employers and employed—there will be only free workers.

"Future society will be Socialist society. This means lastly, that in that society the abolition of wage labour will be accompanied by the complete abolition of the private ownership of the instruments and means of production; there will be neither poor proletarians nor rich capitalists—there will be only workers who collectively own all the land and minerals, all the forests, all the factories and mills, all the railways, etc.

"As you see, the main object of production in the future will be directly to satisfy the needs of society and not to produce goods for sale in order to increase the profits of the capitalists. Here there will be no room for commodity production, struggle for profits, etc.

"It is also clear that future production will be socialistically organised, highly developed production, which will take into account the needs of society and will produce as much as society needs. Here there will be no room either for disintegrated production, competition, crises, or unemployment.

"Where there are no classes, where there are neither rich nor poor, there is no need for a state, there is no need also for political power, which oppresses the poor and protects the rich. Consequently in Socialist society there will be no need for the existence of political power."

JON KEYS.

THE COMPLEX LOAF OF BREAD

BREAD is in the news again. Britain has increased the price of the loaf. Meantime here is an item of news from America.

"If you loaded America's surplus wheat on to a train it would stretch for 4,200 miles—from San Francisco to New York and back again to Kansas City." (*South Wales News*, February, 1956.) This fact concerning the most basic food stuff in the world is a sure testimony to the productive ability of Capitalist society.

Wheat is going to be costlier in Britain whilst there is a tremendous surplus in America. Unfortunately America's surplus wheat is not really available to the world's people, vast numbers of whom are starving.

Of the many crimes one may level at the insane system known as Capitalism, this capacity to deny man the fruits of his labour is one that even the least class-conscious worker knows to be wrong. Mankind appears to be faced with a complex situation. Such complexities as seem to demand complex plans for alleviation; complex conferences—and occasionally—complex wars to try and rectify things. Such is the situation today and "worthy" bodies from U.N.E.S.C.O. to the Salvation Army, are busy tackling the intriguing problem of how to shift surplus wheat into waiting bellies. All the while they fail to do so or do it inadequately.

Here at home things are not quite as bad as they are in some parts of the world. There is full employment; people, in the main, get what bread they need and other things besides. The workers, according to our political and Trade Union leaders, have a lot to be thankful for. What, may we ask, is this "prosperity" dependent upon? Your masters give you your answer every day—upon production—which to you simply means that your day to day living standards depend upon whether your masters can sell the commodities you produce in this or other countries, at the "right" price.

The production and selling costs are enormous: they include price of raw materials, machinery, wages and

marketing costs, which include transport, together with the huge expense involved in maintaining spheres of influence and world sources of marketing and supply, by means of military power in terms of men and armaments. Quite a complex bit of organization again, you see, but unfortunately necessary under their system.

An unknown author once put it this way:—"Man can circle the earth without touching the ground; kill each other when miles apart; weigh the stars; print a million newspapers in an hour; breed the seeds out of an orange; persuade dogs to smoke pipes and cats to play guitars. Man, is indeed, an ingenious animal. But when confronted with one problem, he retires defeated. Show him six men without money and six loaves of bread and ask him 'how the six hungry men can obtain the six loaves.' It is possible that you, the reader, can provide the answer. The Capitalist system cannot.

It is precisely because money is the fulcrum on which Capitalism pivots and to which all things are subject, that we are in our present predicament. Everything created is made to be sold at a profit. If you can pay the price, then brother you can eat 'till you die. When you die, someone—your relatives, friends, or the State—must pay the expense for ridding society of your carcass.

To go back to our six men and the loaves. Mankind looks at the problem—then retires "leaving in the shivering twilight, the tableaux of six hungry men and the six unapproachable loaves."

Socialists want to bring the men and the loaves together. The problem, once understood, is not at all a complex one. By studying the case for Socialism, you, reader, may feel desirous to help.

It is plain enough to see, no one is going to give you your daily bread; they can only sell it to you when conditions are right. When the machine breaks down they cannot sell or give it away. You can, however, take it as a natural right, but first we must have Socialism.

W. BRAIN.

ANARCHIST REFORMISM

An article in *Freedom* (31.12.55) shows the bankruptcy and reformist tendencies of the Anarchist movement. The article, entitled "The Vicious Circle of Gas Rings" deals rather briefly with the monastic (set-up) of modern bed-sitters; how the landlords are after as high a price as they can squeeze for their commodity (as if other sellers aren't!); that conditions are unhygienic, and the distressing fact that a cooker is conspicuous by its absence. "If amenities were made available, such as a small cooker . . . then at least half the trouble could be melted away."

The author of the article seems to think that this business is encouraged by the State, which is actively interested in getting people to marry, as a married person with Hire Purchase commitments is "less inclined to be a radical or a revolutionary. . . ." The writer of the article goes on:—"No council would consider letting one of their flats to a single person. And that is one of the things we need to change."

At least one council (Chelsea Borough Council) lets flats to single people and we can be sure there are others. But apart from this, let us examine the logic of our anarchist's argument. If it is true that the authorities encourage the above state of affairs, so that people tend to get married and therefore not become revolutionaries, etc., and are less inclined to want the "FREE SOCIETY" which the anarchists would have us believe they are after, then their position should be one of supporting the landlords and lodgers set-up; opposing the introduction of cookers in bed-sitters, on the principle that more misery makes more revolutionaries! For, if our "bed-sitters" get their "amenities" it is surely only a matter of time before they too have their H.P. commitments and are lost in the day-dream world of trying to keep up with the Jones's!

The fact is that neither by increasing misery nor by tinkering around with the effects of Capitalism (a gas stove here or there) can we get rid of the class problems

LORD MANCROFT'S ERRORS

The following was reported in the *Manchester Guardian* (February 6, 1956.)

"Lord Mancroft, Parliamentary Under-Secretary to the Home Office, said in London on Saturday: "The Socialists seem to be celebrating their fiftieth anniversary by pulling up the planks of their original platform one by one and hoping that nobody will notice. Mr. Gaitskill has just told us that nationalisation is no longer a panacea and the means test no longer anathema. At this rate there will soon be no platform left. A party is entitled to change its programme to suit the needs of the day, but to change principles is a different matter. Does anyone know what Socialism, as a political philosophy, really means?"

If we did not know how little most professional politicians understand about the Socialist movement we would be astonished that so many errors could be packed into so little space. But we can easily put Lord Mancroft right. It is not the Socialist Party that is celebrating its 50th anniversary but the Labour Party (The Socialist Party celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1954). Socialists never supported Nationalisation and therefore could not abandon it. The Socialist Party has not changed its principles and its only platform is what it has always been, the achievement of Socialism.

of this society. It is property—the ownership by a few, to the exclusion of the many, which causes social problems. Whether it is war—the squabble over property in the form of markets, realisation of profits, sources of raw materials, trade routes, etc., by National groups, or poverty—the position that all workers are in—lacking enough of the things of life to lead a comfortable existence, harassed by insecurity, fear of unemployment, etc., the fact that workers, generally speaking, never get more of the wealth produced by them, than is necessary for them to reproduce themselves as wage-workers. Or even the more superficial problems like refusing to work with coloured people; and "bed-sitters." These are all the problems of a society which produces wealth socially, but doesn't distribute it according to need, a society in which the wealth produced by the working-class (who run society from top to bottom) is in the possession of a parasitical minority who own and control either privately or through the State.

To get rid of the above problems it is no good (as the anarchists do) advocating petty reforms, or the smashing of the State machine. What must be done is the organisation of the working class throughout the world into a cohesive, class-conscious whole, until Socialists are a majority. Then by taking control of the existing political apparatus, they will take over the means of living and make the earth and all that is on it and in it, the common-possession of all people, without distinction of race or sex. For only in a world where all have freedom of access to the wealth of society, can we be rid of war, poverty, bed-sitters, and so on. Such a society, of course, can only be brought about on a world-wide scale by people who understand, desire, and are prepared to work for it in an organised fashion; undermining the basis of Capitalist society and organising for a new one, rather than tinkering around with the effects of this one, like our Anarchist opponents.

JON KEYS.

WHAT IS RACE?

"It is important to emphasize the fact that ethnologists do not always use the word 'race' in a strictly genetic sense."

It is undoubtedly true that people who live in some geographical regions have common hereditary peculiarities which distinguish them from other people.

When Anthropologists use the word race in this sense they follow the same practice as biologists. It is also a fact that some genotypes which do not form compact communities are more frequent in some regions than others. For instance, tall, long-headed people with fair hair and blue eyes are more common in Northern Europe than in other parts of the world. There is no evidence that there has ever been any time in the world's history when all the inhabitants of a particular locality had these characteristics. Though we are entitled to speak of a Nordic type, the Nordic race is a myth." ("Principles of Animal Biology," Prof. Lancelot Hogben.) The Jewish race is also a misnomer.

Human beings who are so classified include immigrants from Palestine or other parts of Asia Minor and their Proselytes among Slav and Tartar peoples of Eastern Europe. Though there is a high concentration of some

hereditary characteristics among members of the Jewish religion and their descendants because of the taboo which forbids interbreeding with those who do not share their peculiar dietetic preferences, no physical characteristics distinguish all Jews as such from any other people.

Their common cultural characteristics are largely, if not exclusively, the product of a common tradition reinforced by persecution and restriction of civil privileges for many centuries. ("Principles of Animal Biology," Prof. Lancelot Hogben).

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA		
SUNDAYS		
Hyde Park East Street (Walworth) ...	3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m.	
	April 1st	12.30 p.m.
	" 8th	11 a.m.
	" 15th	12.30 p.m.
	" 22nd	11 a.m.
	" 29th	12.30 p.m.
Whitestone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.	
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.	
WEDNESDAYS		
Gloucester Road Station ...	8 p.m.	
THURSDAYS		
Jolly Butchers Hill Notting Hill Gate ...	7.30 p.m. 8 p.m.	
FRIDAYS		
Earls Court Station Station Road, Ilford ...	8 p.m. 8 p.m.	
LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS		
Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.		
Tower Hill ...	Thursdays at 1 p.m.	

DARTFORD BRANCH LECTURE
at
Labour Hall, Lowfield Street,
on Friday, 13th April, at 8 p.m.
"Music and Society" — E. KERSLEY

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
(6 months, 2/9) for which 5/6 is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address
.....
.....

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

ANNUAL MAY DAY RALLY AT HYDE PARK
on
SUNDAY 6th MAY from 3 p.m.

PAMPHLETS		
Questions of the Day ...	1/-	(Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War ...	1/-	" " 1/2
Russia Since 1917 ...	1/-	" " 1/2
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years ...	1/-	" " 1/2
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis Socialism ...	1/-	" " 1/2
Socialism or Federal Union? ...	4d.	" " 6d.
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy ...	4d.	" " 6d.
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism? ...	4d.	" " 6d.
Nationalisation or Socialism? ...	6d.	" " 8d.

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 11th and 25th April, 7.30, at address of R. Lee, 35, Manchester St. Phone MAJ 5165.

INDOOR RALLY AT CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.1.

SUNDAY, 6th MAY, at 7.30 p.m.

"POLITICAL MATURITY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM"

Speakers:- R. COSTER and W. READ

Questions and Discussion. All welcome.

GLASGOW (City and Kelvingrove Branches) LECTURES at

CENTRAL HALLS, BATH STREET,
Sundays at 7.30 p.m.

April 8th "Russia To-day"—J. RICHMOND.

" 15th "The Record of the Communist Party"
—R. REID.

" 22nd "Questions of the Day"—A. SHAW.

" 29th "The Urgency of Socialism"—J. HIGGINS
and T. MULHERON

GLASGOW BRANCHES MAY DAY RALLY

SUNDAY, MAY 6th

Queen's Park (Recreation Ground) in the Afternoon

St. Andrews Hall, Berkeley St., in the Evening 7.30 p.m.

All welcome.

NOTTINGHAM BRANCH MAY DAY MASS MEETING

Market Square, Nottingham

SUNDAY, 6th MAY at 3 p.m.

Speakers: J. GARNHAM, J. KEYS, F. WARLOW.

Questions invited.

ARE YOU A MEMBER?

Socialism is worth all the effort that can be put in to achieve it. Progress towards Socialism depends largely upon the number of Socialists organised together to obtain it. The larger the number the more propaganda can be done and the quicker we will get there.

On the inside of the back page of this issue you will find set out our object and Declaration of Principles. If you agree with them your place is in our ranks.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD April, 1956

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (5th and 19th April).

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reevy Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 9th and 23rd April, at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.5.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (11th and 25th April) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

LEYTON Branch meets Mondays 8.0 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10. Lectures and Discussions held 2nd and 4th Monday in each month. Secretary, D. Russell, c/o H.O., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 13th and 27th March, George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.: Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 51, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road, Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form on previous page.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- * Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- * Submit names for sample copies.
- * Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- * Get libraries to display the S.S.
- * Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.

***THE* SOCIALIST STANDARD**

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

TO A NEW READER

★ ★ ★

LORD RUSSELL'S MISCONCEPTIONS

★ ★ ★

THE MATTER WITH MARRIAGE

★ ★ ★

NO SOCIALISM IN RUSSIA

★ ★ ★

YOUR SHARE IN THE WONDERS
OF THE AGE

^D
4

Monthly

No. 621 Vol. 52 May, 1956

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN HOLDS

- 1 That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

YOUR SHARE IN THE WONDERS OF THE AGE

What Is and What Could Be

AT school and in the books and papers that we read we are always being told of the wonderful technical developments of the age we live in. The politicians who oppose Socialism give the theme a propaganda twist by arguing that it is capitalism that gives us these things and we would be foolish to give up the social system that does so much for us. The worker of a century ago, they say, did not have the benefit of all the marvels that the worker in 1956 is free to enjoy. But this is the heart of the matter: is the worker of today free to enjoy them? Let us examine two of the fields in which invention has been most spectacular—transport and communications.

Certain facts are beyond dispute. A hundred years ago there were no motor cars, no high-speed luxury liners, no supersonic air-travel, no telegraphs, no telephones or wireless, no radio or television. Messages can now be flashed round the globe in a few seconds, you can travel far and fast in comfort, news and opinions can be radioed anywhere and picked up by all who have sets, though this means only a smallish minority of the world's population.

What then is wrong with the argument of defenders of Capitalism? They leave two things out of account. One is that under Capitalism you can only have what you can afford to pay for. The other is that the savage class struggles and international conflicts that Capitalism incites prevent most of these freedoms from being used for the good of mankind. Under Socialism the use of all these technical developments would be freely available to all; under Capitalism they are used, for the most part, as appendages to profit-making industry and commerce, and subject all the time—even for the rich who could afford them—to the demands and restrictions imposed by the greatest of all industries, preparation for war.

Is this an overstatement? Let us see. Let us take first the postal, telegraph, telephone and cable networks. The great bulk of all their traffic is for business and State purposes not for the enjoyment of the private lives of the mass of the population; it is mostly business traffic and would disappear under Socialism. This is even true of the least expensive of them, the postal services. Apart from Pool entries and Xmas cards workers rarely use the posts, and more rarely still the telegraph and cable services. Most of the telephones are business lines or the residential lines of the well to do. A small minority of working class homes have unshared lines but for most workers, using the telephone for personal calls means using the "communal" telephone in apartment houses or

the street kiosk, with of course a considerable volume of calls made on the firm's lines in office hours. Even in U.S.A., where telephone development has gone farthest, large numbers of subscribers put up with the inconveniences of shared lines because they are cheaper. In Russia, telephonically most backward of the Powers, the number of workers who have their own lines is a tiny minority of the working class.

And the chief cause of this everywhere is that the workers' wages do not extend to meeting the cost of an unshared telephone except at the expense of some other comfort or convenience.

The Workers' Choice

It is the same with motor cars, television sets and travel. Workers are free to choose from all the rich variety spread before them but only within the narrow limits of their wage packets. For many it is only by living in a slum or cramped and dilapidated houses that they can afford their television set, or their old creak of a car that endangers their own and other people's lives on the roads. Why are there 1,500,000 pre-war cars still in use except chiefly because of cheapness? Have a car and a T.V. set and cut down on holidays, clothes and other expenditure: that is the common choice. A *News Chronicle* reporter, inquiring of five London dealers about people buying new cars found the dealers surprised that money was forthcoming in spite of the raising of the deposit to 50 per cent. He asked some of the purchasers how they did it. "I spoke to four who had, between them, cut smoking, sold the T.V., sold furniture and economised on food. Two of their wives had gone out to work." (*News Chronicle* 2/4/56).

The brewers even complain of falling sales of beer that have accompanied the buying of T.V. sets and travel abroad. Go away on holiday and take the rest of the year to save the money by going to work on cheap early morning tickets packed like half-alive sardines.

You can travel by luxury air-liner all over the world if you have the money; but most workers have never travelled by air, and most of those who have do so only in the Armed Forces when Capitalism is at war. You can holiday abroad, if you have long enough holidays, and if, as a worker, you resign yourself for the rest of the year to going without other things in order to save up the money. The great majority of British workers have never been abroad except for war, and have no passports.

And what of the freedom of movement and communication as progressively narrowed by governments for military and other reasons? Freedom to settle in other

countries is more restricted now than for many decades. Trains, cars, ships and planes can easily carry you across frontiers, subject, however, to the restrictions and immigration quotas and entry permits imposed by governments. Hence the widespread and often costly activities to secure illegal entry, and the dangerous traffic of human beings fleeing across barbed and mined and guarded frontiers of the iron curtain and other countries.

The Marvels of Communication

You can communicate with people living all over the world, provided that, for many countries, you pass the censorship on foreign mails and telegraph calls. The air is free to broadcast—except that a very large part of the world's radio equipment is now devoted solely to the jamming of foreign broadcasts.

After a century of technical development of communications the flow of information and propaganda over

many frontiers is now limited to balloons! (It will probably rise to still higher efficiency and employ the pigeon post).

It may be objected that at least "free" Britain does not engage in these retrograde practices. This objection overlooks the restrictions of entry to this country and the censorship in some colonies; and the new development of British jamming of broadcasts in Cyprus and the Middle East.

And here at home the S.P.G.B. has for 20 years been steadfastly refused any opportunity to put the Socialist case on the air by the B.B.C.

This is how Capitalism works in all fields. Under Capitalism the working class have invented, discovered, and produced, all the technical marvels, but Capitalism fetters and distorts them all for the profit-making and military needs of the Capitalist groups of the world.

H.

A READER WHO DOES NOT READ VERY WELL

[We have received from a reader the following letter. For some reason he also sent it to *Forward*, but added a covering note that he was willing, if we liked, to type it out again as being addressed to us. His references are to two articles in the April SOCIALIST STANDARD, "What Holds us Back?" and "The Complex Loaf of Bread."—Ed. COMM.]

CONFOUND THEIR POLITICS

To the Editor of the *Forward*.

Sir,—It is now some time since I abandoned all politics. But I still read the *Forward* and the *Daily Herald*, and I subscribe to both the SOCIALIST STANDARD and the *Freedom*. I gave up all politics because of the prejudices, prevarications, misrepresentations and downright lies disseminated by all Parties alike, and in the current number of the STANDARD I find ample justification for all my aversions from politics. In this issue of the organ of the Socialist Party of Great Britain it is admitted that they have made little progress, but, in the true Party manner, the blame for this lack of headway is laid on others. We are told, "If all those who have fallen out had remained in the movement what a strong movement for Socialism we would have now." This is Joshua and the sun again. Truth can no more be commanded to stand still than can the sun. Christianity was in existence a long time before the S.P.G.B. was heard of, and Christianity has crumbled to what is left now for the sole reason that it is not true, and has made no real attempts at correcting its untruth. Members have left and will continue to leave the S.P.G.B. because—they do not believe in it. A bitter pill, but it has to be swallowed or the patient will perish.

But the prize in this precious number goes to the contributor who, writing about bread, quotes an "unknown author" who, after enumerating the many triumphs of mankind, goes on to say, "Man is indeed an ingenious animal. But when confronted with one problem he retires defeated. Show him six men without money and six loaves of bread, and ask him how the six men can obtain the six loaves?" Our contributor comments cockily on this, "It is possible that you, the reader, can provide the answer. The Capitalist system cannot." This is how politics can dope and hypnotise ordinary intelligence. The circumstances posed by the "unknown author" have not existed for at least 50 years. For at least 50 years it has been possible for six hungry men without money to get six loaves of bread. And this under Capitalism. Due in

some measure to Labour Party influence it is easier to-day than ever before, but the Labour Party is not a Socialist Party and we are still under Capitalism. The Labour Party has made Capitalism work better. This is a jibe the S.P.G.B. is fond of flinging at the Labour Party. But, when political expediency calls for it, the S.P.G.B. can forget the Labour Party has done even that. Thus faithfully does the politician worship truth!!

Yours sincerely,

DAVID MacCONNELL.

REPLY

Our critic attacks us on two counts. One is that we are alleged to want to avoid admitting what, according to him, is the real reason the Socialist movement makes only slow progress. He says it would be a bitter pill for us to have to admit that members have left the S.P.G.B. because they do not believe in it. We can only say that our critic, who claims he is a reader of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, must be a very careless or inattentive reader. In the first place the article he criticises did not seek to explain the slow progress of the Socialist movement wholly or mainly by the dropping out of disheartened members. What it did say was that the Socialist movement has made slow progress because the great majority of the workers have not been won over to Socialism. As this is what the S.P.G.B. has always said our critic ought to be familiar with it, and ought to know that we have always ridiculed the silly notion held by some reformist organisations that the mass of the workers are already Socialists. The reference in our April issue to those who have dropped out because of disheartenment emphatically did not say that all who have dropped out have done so for that reason. It was prompted by the fact that the letter to which we were replying was written by an ex-member who indicated that he still agrees with the S.P.G.B. case. (In a subsequent letter he wrote applying for re-admission to the S.P.G.B.)

So much for our critic's first mare's nest.

His second is even more illusory. He tears out of its context a passage about Capitalism's inability to provide articles to those who need them except on the condition that they have the money to pay. He reads a short quoted illustration about six loaves of bread and six hungry men and fails to see the very obvious fact that this was an illustration of the general nature of Capitalist distribution. It was a correct illustration. Under Capitalism you do not have free access to loaves of bread,

or to unsaleable motor cars, or to anything else simply by taking them without price and without having to get somebody's permission. Free access would be the condition under Socialism; it is not the condition under Capitalism. If our critic is so naive as to believe that it is, he has only to try it by walking into a shop and taking what he wants. He will be able to tell us how he got on some time later—when they let him out.

Of course he has in mind that under Capitalism in this country, as "improved" by the Labour Party and others, the hungry man, subject to certain conditions and after going through the degrading process of applying for Public Assistance, can get niggardly financial aid, as indeed he could long before the Labour Party was thought of. In the Middle Ages such charity was dispensed by the Church and Monasteries.

ROUGH WINDS AND RATTLING KNOCKERS

"Rough winds," sang the bard, "do shake the darling buds of May." Many party members are hoping that during this May in particular the winds will blow a little more kindly, because for the first time we are making a combined effort to increase sales of the SOCIALIST STANDARD by widespread canvassing. A number of branches in London and elsewhere are taking part and have sent representatives to a meeting at Head Office to set up a co-ordinating committee, with the general object of doubling their usual monthly STANDARD sales. If everything goes to plan, a great many knockers will be rattling during this month.

These are difficult times for Socialist propaganda, when workers are more inclined to stay in for television soap operas than come out to listen to a speaker on a windy platform. To this problem canvassing is part at

But what a petty point anyway, when measured against the gigantic evils and hardships of Capitalism's peace and war to-day! And what a purblind attitude, to approach the problem as if it concerned only the workers in this country! Actually, as the article "The Complex Loaf of Bread" pointed out, it is a fact that at the present time America has fantastic stocks of unsaleable wheat while large numbers of the world's population go hungry. United Nations inquiries have indicated that a third or more of the world's population are undernourished.

Let our critic deny this if he can and let him tell us what solution there is apart from Socialism. As he tells us that he has long since "abandoned all politics" he must believe he knows a non-political solution unless, perhaps, he believes that the social problems of the human race have already been solved.

Ed. COMM.

any rate, of an answer—if people will not come to us, then we must go to them. And there is no need to be hesitant about knocking them up—a surprising number are quite willing to leave even Miss Shirley Abicair to talk about the problems of the live-a-day world. Apart from that, canvassing has its exhilaration of hard work and its fun—one comrade who disappeared from a Sunday morning expedition came puffing up half an hour later to explain that a housewife had mistaken him for the rent collector and he had drunk three cups of tea and promised to mend her drainpipes before she had realised her mistake.

At all events it is worthy activity which over the years can build up a solidly regular readership for our journal. We hope to publish the results of the drive in our July issue. Meanwhile, there is a lot of work to be done.

IVAN.

MAY DAY REVERIE

AN old man sat watching the fire burn away. His scarred features and heaving chest marked him as one of many to be found in the coal-field—men who had sold their strength and virility whilst it lasted and now, having nothing to sell, were on their way out.

Another May Day was passing—quietly—almost unnoticed except for the old timers' like Evan Hughes. May Day was, after all, the traditional day of rejoicing, bringing once more the promise of warmth, plenty and a new life to the peasant folk of early times, and Evan was a descendent of such people. Over a century ago they had come flocking into the valleys with the soil of the fields clinging to their trousers. Freed from the shackles of the Squire and Landlord, they took upon themselves, willingly, the fetters of their new masters the Coal Owners. Evan had grown up in the valley. He had seen the coal barons, like the feudal lords of an earlier age, push out their frontiers; the lengthening grey ribbons of industrial barracks that served as houses; the black pyramids of slag that grew higher as the newly formed conscripts of Capital hewed their way into the virgin coal seams.

The valleys were a hard training ground, and it is not surprising that hard, tough men emerged. Yet, with it all, gentleness and kindness prevailed everywhere and the periods of distress and suffering were shared in common. It is little wonder that from these valleys poured men who were masters in the world's boxing rings, whose oratory from platform and pulpit thrilled the nation; whose singing lifted the heart. Yes, there were giants in the old times. Men there were who had led their com-

rades in fight after fight for "a living wage," "work or maintenance," and a hundred and one things that Evan had now forgotten and his grandchildren had never heard of. It had all passed, and now, May Day was fading with the light. The clock ticked on relentlessly in a silence broken only by a cinder falling from the burnt-out fire. The old man in the chair seemed to portray the futility of it all.

Evan, and those like him, are passing away. What can we say for them? That they were sincere fighters for a better world there can be no doubt. We charge them with no crime. They were, after all, the victims in a tragedy—unaware of the nature of the society they sought to better. They were often caught in the moment of the grand oration, duped by the opportunist slogan. Responsive with a dog-like devotion to their leaders whom they sent to Parliament, where in time they achieved the cherished but empty dream of Nationalization. And now?

The story continues, though Evan is no longer interested. The ranks of the "old contemptibles" are rapidly thinning leaving the present generation to carry on the struggle for the life that is as far away as ever. There are today no shortages of leaders, the slogans continue to pour out, the orations are to hand for the occasion. The workers in the valleys and everywhere else on May Day, 1956, still find themselves spinning around the fulcrum of Capitalism, dancing to the latest tune their masters care to play. Is it any wonder they are dizzy?

W. BRAIN.

TO A NEW READER

THERE are many parties, both large and small, appealing for your support to-day. Some of them do so with the claim that they are Socialist parties, but you have no touch-stone to guide your judgment. You are bewildered by the multitude of parties who all claim that their object is to help you. In fact, there is only one way out of your dilemma—to help yourself by gaining a little knowledge of the society you are living in; its basis, its capacities, and its contradictions.

In a story of the life of King Edward VII., that is printed in the *Evening Standard* (4/4/1956), we are told that he lived in a "glittering world of wealth and privilege, from one end of Europe to the other." That referred to the first ten years of the present century, when the majority of the people, the workers, worked for wages that only gave them a precarious existence and a large proportion lived in slums. While the glitter was still there the world was plunged into devastating war that brought misery to millions of people.

In the issue of the *Evening Standard* that prints the above there is also a reference to the recent death of F. Jay Gould, the American multi-millionaire, from which we learn that, according to his second wife, "Those were fabulous days. He built a villa for us at Maison-Raffite." Later they took a chateau with 100 rooms, where they lived throughout the 1914-1918 war. The hunger marches of the twenties and the crisis at the beginning of the thirties permitted him to wallow in his millions. Now his relatives are fighting over the division of the spoils he has left behind him.

Thus, throughout the present century, a relatively small number of people have lived in a glittering world of wealth and privilege whilst the vast majority have lived in a world of toil and penury. Why are there these two worlds? Must it always be so?

Man is spoken of as being a social animal. He associates with others of his kind—forms part of a society. A society is a group of individuals bound together by a common principle. The larger sense in which the word society is generally used refers to the common principle of obtaining a living. Whatever is referred to as "social" concerns man in his connection with other men. Thus when we say a thing is socially produced we mean that a number of men produce different parts of an article and their combined efforts produce the finished article. That is the way almost all we eat, drink and wear, is produced to-day, and workers from all over the world produce different parts of the final product. No Capitalist need spend an hour in this work, and very rarely does. But by reason of their ownership of the means of production the Capitalists, as a class, own the products. Thus the products are socially produced but privately owned.

You are living in a society to-day in which the things produced, and the tools by means of which they are produced, are privately owned: that is, owned by one individual or by a relatively small group of individuals—either a single Capitalist a small group of Capitalists, or the Capitalist investors in a State concern. The aim of the Socialist is to make these things social property; to convert these privately owned goods and tools into goods and tools commonly owned by the whole of society. He who acts in such a way as to bring this state of affairs into being is a Socialist: he who acts in a way that hinders progress to this end is evidently not a Socialist, no matter what he may call himself.

Owing to the private ownership of the means of production the majority of the people of this country are unable to obtain the things they need except by working for those that own them; the Capitalist class. These two types, owners and non-owners, masters and workers, broadly speaking make up modern society. They form two distinct classes, one of whom depends for a living upon working, and the other upon owning what is produced.

You, to whom we address these lines, belong to the working class. Whether you are paid wages or a salary, you depend for your living upon selling your mental and physical energies to an employer. Between you and your employers there exists a constant struggle over the destination of the wealth you produce. By wage-claims, strikes, or threatened strikes, you struggle to obtain as large a share of the wealth you produce as possible. It is a share you think of, you don't think of obtaining the whole, because you think of and argue about a "high" or a "low" wage. Your thoughts are bound up with the wages system. The employers on their side resist your wage claims and try to pay you as low wages as possible. This struggle over the division of the wealth you produce is an expression of what the Socialist calls the class war. In spite of the so-called full employment it has been carried on unceasingly since the end of the second Great War. All the time wages were chasing rising prices, and the process looks like continuing indefinitely.

As long as you accept the present class ownership basis of society there is no hope of a fundamental improvement in your conditions. Wars, slumps, bad housing, and the other evils that are a permanent feature of your lives will continue, no matter what political party is in power. There is only one road to salvation—the establishment of Socialism. When the wealth produced, and the tools by which it has been produced, have been made into the common property of society there will be no more war, nor will anyone lack either food or shelter. Each will give to society of his best and receive in return the best society can give, regardless of age, sex or occupation.

We are members of the working class, and we want you to join us and help us to carry on the struggle for Socialism. Why are we anxious for your aid? We are in the same mess as you are, and we cannot get out of the mess except by the same way as you. We want Socialism because it offers us the only means of leading secure, healthy and comfortable lives; but we cannot get Socialism until you want it. Therefore we want you to want Socialism and to join with us in the struggle to obtain it: then we will all have an equal opportunity of enjoying the best that life can offer.

GILMAC.

ARE YOU A MEMBER?

Socialism is worth all the effort that can be put in to achieve it. Progress towards Socialism depends largely upon the number of Socialists organised together to obtain it. The larger the number the more propaganda can be done and the quicker we will get there. On the inside of the front page of this issue you will find set out our object and Declaration of Principles. If you agree with them your place is in our ranks.

"OLD MEN FORGET"

Lord Russell's Misconceptions

FOR many years Bertrand Russell was what is known as a progressive thinker. He had ideas on sex, education, morals, etc., which startled, even shocked, many of his contemporaries. In the first World War he was a Pacifist and went to prison. In some circles he underwent a period of social ostracism. By 1931 the honeymoon delight of being wedded to progress was not only over but disillusion had set in. In "Living Philosophies" (Simon and Schuster, New York), Russell said "he wrote on the firm foundation of unyielding despair... brief and powerless is man's life; on him and all his race the slow sure doom falls pitiless and dark." Such was the mature judgment of this progressive thinker. He has never so far as one can gather categorically renounced this view, although from time to time he has offered variations on the theme.

One such variation appeared in an article in the *News Chronicle* (26.3.56) called the "Fraud of Marxism." Here we are informed that the safety of the world, is precariously balanced between totalitarian Russia, which he makes synonymous with Communism, and the Western powers. Russell seems to view this as symbolical of the struggle between the powers of light and darkness. A war between these rival groups, via the hydrogen bomb, could lead, he thinks, to something near the virtual destruction of the world. This, of course, might mean the fulfilment of his 1931 prophecy. It is a conclusion which Russell himself does not apparently want to accept. Now there might be ways of avoiding the holocaust. Communism, he says, thrives on poverty and hatred, therefore let us diminish those areas. One way, it seems, is to renounce the relics of white domination in Asia.

Russell ignores the fact that it is Capitalism, whether East or West, which produces and perpetuates poverty and hatred. Just as he ignores the fact that Capitalism is not only the domination of white over coloured people but also domination by White over White. Wherever capital rules it constitutes an instrument of domination over the vast majority of the population. Given the development of Capitalism in Asia it will result in the domination of the vast majority by a handful of people, who live in the same country instead of some other country.

Russell plans to kill Communism by kindness, not that the ex-Pacifist who once believed war to be an evil thing and Capitalism an evil system, is opposed to killing Russians on principle. He is merely opposed to killing them on expediency. With the advent of the H. Bomb it appears we can no longer serve the ends of justice by exterminating "our enemies," without exterminating ourselves. Perhaps Communism and with it the Russian people, could have been eliminated on principle. Russell believes that war against Russia might have once been possible. Such a war could have been atomically waged by the Western powers before Russia possessed atomic weapons. Indeed, there were reports from Adelaide that our 'progressive thinker' had mooted such proposals while he was there.

Nevertheless Russell has, at least, been consistent in his inconsistency. Posing as a sceptic he liked to feel that he asserted nothing; no not even that he asserted nothing. This has not prevented him from dogmatically making up his mind on oft occasions and then just as dogmatic-

ally unmaking it. While everyone is privileged to change their views, Russell has tended to abuse that privilege.

Not only has Russell at times flatly contradicted former views he held but he has never offered any evidence for his change of front. In his book, "In Praise of Idleness" (p. 145) he held that "the causes



of war were mainly economic." Again on p. 147, he averred that "the causes of enmity between nations are mainly to be found in the economic interests of certain sections and can only be abolished by a fundamental economic reconstruction." Now it seems the enmity between nations is between the free Democratic West and the Totalitarian East. The stark fact remains that the ideological battle between the Western powers and Russia has its origin in imperial and economic rivalry.

Given a realignment of economic rivalries there would be corresponding shifts in ideological differences. Russian totalitarianism might then be acceptable to some Western Democracies in the future as it has been in the past. Russell, by concealing these differences under idealistic trappings, helps to increase misunderstanding of the real nature of power politics. It is thus a heavy contribution which the one-time Pacifist makes towards increasing the enmity of nations and with it the continuance of the possibility of war.

Russell once believed that "Capitalism was doomed. Its injustices were so glaring that only ignorance and tradition would lead wage earners to tolerate it." ("Theory and Practice of Bolshevism" p. 19). He even believed that "the present holders of power were evil men and that there was no perfidy or brutality from which

Continued on page 73

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

MAY



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

NO SOCIALISM IN RUSSIA

IT is very important to the Socialist Party of Great Britain that there should be no confusion about the state of affairs in Russia. The aim of the S.P.G.B. is to see Socialism established everywhere but our propaganda for Socialism is hampered by the belief, held by some people, that Socialism means the kind of social arrangements that existed in Russia under Stalin and exist still. There is no truth in this whatsoever. There is no Socialism (or Communism) in Russia, nor has there ever been.

What Russia has is a régime of dictatorship, administering what can best be described as a largely State Capitalist social system. The State apparatus is controlled by the Communist Party of Russia, the only political party that is allowed to exist in that country. Farical so-called elections are held, but, as the workers of Russia are not allowed to form political parties of their own choice, only members of the Communist Party and those approved by them are permitted to stand at election and be elected. This is an issue by which to assess the recent talk of changed conditions in Russia. Stalin is dead and some of his actions have been repudiated but it is still the case that no political party is allowed to exist in Russia except the Communist Party. It was over 20 years ago that Stalin had to admit to some visiting Americans that in Russia "only one party, the party of the workers, the Communist Party, enjoys legality." ("Interviews with Foreign Workers' Delegates." Published in Moscow 1934, p. 13).

The same idea had been pithily put still earlier by Bukharin, who declared that in Russia there is room for any number of political parties, as long as one is in power and the others in prison.

The British Communist Party has just reaffirmed its confidence in the Communist Party of Russia. Let it

clearly be understood that this is a renewed declaration of support by the British Communist Party for a régime that suppresses all independent working class political activity. While this condition remains it is idle to pretend that the new rulers of Russia are showing evidence of a changeover from dictatorship to more democratic arrangements.

In asserting that there never has been Socialism in Russia the S.P.G.B. is not making a late discovery. Right from 1917 when the Communists were able to get power in Russia it has been emphasised by the S.P.G.B. that Socialism had not been established in that country. Our declaration on this point and our explanation of the reasons were placed on record in the columns of the SOCIALIST STANDARD and a selection of the articles was reproduced, unchanged, in the pamphlet "Russia Since 1917" (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/2).

The reader who wishes to know what has been the attitude of the Socialist Party towards events in Russia under the Communist Party dictatorship is referred to that collection of articles. He will see there that the Socialist Party in aim and in method has nothing in common with the Communist Parties of Russia and other countries.

WHICH ARE THE BIGGEST?

DO you know the name of the biggest company in Great Britain? Or the names of the first three? Or of the first ten?

On page 78 are listed the names of the top 25 companies, as given in a recent survey. How many of them can you place?

To be quite fair, we must mention that the survey confines itself to public companies, i.e., those with shares quoted on the Stock Exchange, and to companies trading mainly in the United Kingdom. This means, for example, that big companies like Shell and the British American Tobacco Company are excluded.

LOVE AND MARRIAGE

"Look closely into the homes of those who struggle to keep and educate two children, those whose job depends upon their appearance of affluence. Behind the scenes you will find financial strain, real poverty, self-denial, and at an early age, contraception and all its mental stresses and physical disappointments. It is the spirit of home life and parenthood which suffers. Love itself is starved and often blamed for its own decline. When love goes, anything may go, but worst of all, the most glorious gift of womanhood remains inhibited and immature. The spirit of motherhood is never fully developed; our social system is gradually crushing the most powerful force for real goodness that is known to the human race."

(From *Childhood Without Fear*, page 216, by Dr. Grantly Dick Read, M.A., M.D. Heinemann Medical Books.)

CANVASSERS WANTED FOR SALES DRIVE

Elsewhere in this issue is a list of arrangements for the special drive to sell the "Socialist Standard." The help of members is urgently needed. Further information is obtainable from the Literature Canvassing Committee at Head Office.

"OLD MEN FORGET" — continued from page 71

they would shrink when they feel themselves threatened" (same book, p. 10). Now this role is assigned exclusively to the rulers of Russia.

He also likes to assert from time to time that he was unique in knowing the real significance of the Russian Revolution. In actual fact he was in many respects confused and muddleheaded. Even in 1920 he still believed the Bolsheviks aimed to establish Socialism in Russia, when in fact, as we pointed out at the time, they were building up State Capitalism. Actually Russell's notions of Capitalism and Socialism have been so foggy that he has never been able to distinguish one from the other.

His only real quarrel with the Bolsheviks was not that they were not Socialists, but that they were using the wrong methods for establishing it. He also thought that "Bolshevism deserves the gratitude and admiration of all the progressive part of mankind" ("Theory and Practice of Bolshevism" p. 7). Russell, it seems thought Socialism could have come to Russia had it been done the Russell way. And this from someone who has always claimed that he was one of the prescient few who really knew what was taking place.

It is ironic to reflect that Russell then attributed to the Western powers the same evil intent against Russia that he now attributes to Russia against the Western powers ("Theory and Practice of Bolshevism, p. 10).

His criticism of Marx in the same article is the usual mixture of childishness and spite. According to Russell Marx believed in something called dialectical materialism which governs the human history independent of human volition. This says Russell is mythology. He is right, but the myth is one perpetrated by Russell not by Marx. He cannot show where Marx ever held or stated such a view.

He also contends that Marx's doctrine of surplus value was merely surreptitiously introducing the malthusian theory of population. This is nonsense. Malthus believed that the meagre resources of the earth would be insufficient for the needs of an ever-increasing population. As a result the vast majority of mankind would always be condemned to exist at the lowest level. Marx utterly repudiated this notion and showed that the evils of Capitalism flowed from the way it produced and distributed wealth. Marx denied that there was some abstract law of population. Different societies he contended would have different laws. Over-population, said Marx, was intimately connected with the growth of capital accumulation and took the form of relative over-

population i.e. an industrial reserve army.

Neither did Marx, vide Russell, believe in an iron law of wages which maintains wages at a mere physical subsistence level. In fact he devoted much time against Lassalle and others to show the falsity of such views. If Russell had even read a simple pamphlet like "Value, Price and Profit," he could have gleaned the information that Marx not only believed that the workers could by Trade Union action raise their standards of living but further the gains from these struggles helped to mould the traditional standards of life for the future. That Capitalism did regulate levels of wages, Marx did not deny; wages could not, he thought, proceed to levels which seriously threatened surplus value, or eliminated it, but this had nothing to do with the Malthusian doctrine of an iron law of wages.

As for historical materialism, which Russell repudiates, Russell has never understood it. He has, like many others, seen it as merely an economic interpretation. This has, nevertheless, not prevented him from largely agreeing with what he has largely misunderstood. Thus in "Freedom and Social Organisation" (p.220), he says "with regard to the economic interpretation of history it seems very largely true and a most important contribution to sociology." He has also informed us that "in the main he agrees with Marx that economic causes are at the bottom of the great movements in history, not only in political movements, but also those departments such as religion, art, morals."

Russell, who fancies himself as an historian, has not been above surreptitiously attempting to apply the theory he now repudiates which turned out to be the crassest economic determinism. Thus his views on American history are formulated in economic terms. According to him the 1929 crisis which occurred in America was the result of the absence of cheap labour and cheap land. The open frontier and slavery are put forward as the crucial factors in America during the 19th century. While not once but many times he has pronounced that Capitalism is doomed and that a new system will emerge because of an unavoidable economic development. Russell may no longer believe in all this, but he is not, as he imagines, repudiating Marx, but himself. Like most of the intellectuals he has been so busy trying to teach others that he has had little time to learn himself.

Russell once wrote in a playful mood his own obituary. It also modestly assessed his own contribution to society. It is sad to reflect that in his declining years he has also provided his own pathetic epitaph.

E.W.

A SOCIALIST

A SOCIALIST is a person who desires a new social system. That is to say, Socialism; a world-wide social order equalitarian in character, where the means of living are the common possession of all, and freedom of access to all that society can produce, and where full participation in all that society does is the norm. Of necessity it will be a society where free co-operation and organisation has been taken to its logical conclusion, and where coercion has died a natural death. For obviously in a world where one can help oneself freely to the needs of life there can be no economic domination of man over man, and all organisation must be of the free kind.

As Socialism will be a world-wide affair; it can only be brought about by Socialists throughout the world

organising on a world-wide scale. In other words, a Socialist is not only a person who desires Socialism, but also a person who understands Capitalism in a general sense, and sees the need for working in an organised fashion to get rid of it, to replace the system with a Socialist one. What is even more to the point, is that a Socialist is one who not only works in an organised fashion to bring about Socialism, but who expects to work in an organised fashion within Socialist society.

Spivs, and layabouts, whether of the Capitalist variety or otherwise, can have no part in a Socialist society. Too often has the writer heard it said at meetings by a member of the audience: "I am all for a world where I can help myself freely to whatever is produced, as I would be able to lie around all day." Apart from

the fact that no human being is *naturally* lazy, if a majority of people wanted Socialism and were in the above category it could not be established. For Socialism being a society where *all* people's needs will be satisfied; this can only take place if there is a majority of people throughout the world who understand that they must co-operate together to produce enough to satisfy *all* people's needs. In other words FREE ACCESS. This state of affairs could not be brought about by a bunch of people who only want to laze around.

THE PASSING SHOW

Success

State Capitalism marches on from triumph to triumph. British European Airways last year turned 1954's loss of £400,000 into a profit of £862,000 (*The Star*, 28-2-56). And hard on the heels of this announcement comes the news that the British Overseas Airways Corporation almost doubled its net profit in the financial year 1955-56. It made a gross profit of about £1,750,000 on the year, and a net profit of about £500,000. This compared with last year's net profit of £260,000 (*The Observer*, 1-4-56). These successes will no doubt make those staunch Labourites, who for years devoted themselves to bringing about the nationalization of the country's basis industries, feel very proud. Or will they?

. . . . for the Capitalists

The Socialist Party has consistently pointed out for more than half a century that nationalization is no more than Capitalism run by the State or its nominees. It has nothing to do with Socialism. And the more experience the country has of the actual running of nationalization, the more it becomes obvious that what the Socialist Party has always said about it is true. Now even social anthropologists, quietly pursuing their studies far removed from the hurly-burly of political conflict, arrive at the same conclusion. Norman Dennis, Fernando Henriques and Clifford Slaughter, have written a book embodying the results of their researches into the life of a Yorkshire mining town. "They found that"—to quote a review in *The Times* (5-4-56)—"they found that, in the mines, the old fundamental conflict between management and men has continued, and that the system of piece-work payments gives occasions every day for conflict between worker and management." Of course it does. It is merely one aspect of the class struggle. The review of the book ("Coal is our Life") goes on:

"The miner remains an employee, and whether or no he works is still dependent on the capacity of owners of capital to cater for him."

The Socialist case could hardly be put more clearly than that. The worker is propertyless; therefore he is forced to sell his ability to work to the "owners of capital"; and if the owners of capital cannot make a profit out of his work, they will not employ him, and so he is not allowed to work at all. Instead he goes on the dole, and his physical energies and mental faculties rot together. And this is the case whether he works in an industry run by private or by State capitalism.

And yet—probably on the very day you buy this paper—the left-wing political parties hold May-Day demonstrations to demand further doses of nationalization! Will they never learn?

To recapitulate, Socialism can only be brought about throughout the world by a majority of people who understand the system under which they live. Understand what it is they are going to put in its place; desire it and are prepared to co-operate in an organised fashion to establish such a system, and work within it, once it is established.

Anyone who agrees with what has been briefly outlined above should contact the nearest branch, for only Socialists who are organised can bring about Socialism.
JON KEYS.

Sales Manager

The barnstorming tour of Mr. Malenkov through Britain has been providing journalists with a lot of copy during the past week or two. Patting children on the head, switching on a wide grin for the photographers, scattering "peace-medals" like confetti at a wedding, he has been arousing the ire of some political commentators who fear he may make Russia too popular. This situation is not without its humour. For the reports of Mr. Malenkov's doings—not forgetting his occasional gaucheries, such as asking an Ayr workman what he thought of Burns—are highly reminiscent of election-time, when the candidates of the big parties go cap in hand to the electors to solicit their votes. And the aforementioned commentators, none of whom complain about the activities of Parliamentary candidates who support the British ruling class, are now hoarsely indignant that Mr. Malenkov may win backing for the Russian ruling class by using the same dubious tactics. But what is sauce for Sir Anthony Eden and Mr. Gaitskill is also sauce for Mr. Malenkov—as well as for Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev, when they follow in Malenkov's footsteps; and only those who have criticised the electioneering tactics of the British political leaders have any right to criticise the same tactics now being employed by the Russians.

I see it all now

Mr. Malenkov has come to Britain at a crisis in the fortunes of the world's Communist Parties. The present leaders of the Soviet Communist Party have severely attacked the Stalin legend, and have boldly said about their late master what nearly everyone else has been saying about him for the last 30 years. And the Communist Party of Great Britain has, naturally, followed suit. The poor old British Bolsheviks have had to perform the about turn so often that, in revolutions per minute, they must now be challenging the internal combustion engine. Mr. Pollitt is reported to have fobbed off questions with the remark that, if Stalin hadn't made any mistakes, he wouldn't have been human. The accuracy of this remark is unchallengeable; but what a pity Mr. Pollitt didn't have the guts to say so ten years ago, instead of spending his time kissing the ground in front of the great Stalin myth.

It may be that, for some time at any rate, Russia will be ruled by a committee of men instead of by one man. Developing Russian Capitalism seems to require—like developing English and French Capitalism required—a totalitarian regime at a certain stage; and it appears that the Russian ruling class has now decided that the "leadership" cult has been overdone. But committee-rule would not make Russia any more demo-

cratic. The powers of a police state like Russia may be exercised, just as effectively by ten men as by one. It is easy enough, for Communists inside and outside Russia, to criticise a fallen idol; but Russians will not have freedom of speech until they are at liberty to challenge the false theories of social development to which Communists have committed themselves, and to discuss publicly whether the Russian system is Socialism, or whether—as is in fact the case—it is merely State Capitalism.

Seconds out of the ring

So the British Royal Family has declined invitations to attend the forthcoming Royal Wedding of the Year (on my right, Prince Rainier, title-holder of Monaco; on my left, Grace Kelly, star attraction from Philadelphia and Hollywood). Which is curious. One would have thought the few remaining royalties would try to consolidate the ranks. But there may be an explanation. For when the crowds cheered at the Philip-Elizabeth wedding, and subsequently at the Coronation, the commentators rushed forward to tell us why. It was (we were told) Loyalty, the great throbbing Loyalty of the British people to its monarch. But now the same British people is showing just as much interest in the wedding of Rainier and Kelly—the representatives respectively of the Monte Carlo gaming-tables and the Californian arc-lights. Can it be that life within Capitalism is so drab that the British people would enthuse over anything which offered a little glamour, gaiety and colour, and that this much-vaunted Loyalty doesn't come into it?

Exit Ceylon

While we're on the subject of loyalty, a word about Ceylon. When the Queen undertook the round-the-Empire tour after the Coronation, nowhere was she more enthusiastically received than in Ceylon. Ah! said the experts—loyal Ceylon! But the results of Ceylon's general election now show a landslide in favour of Mr. Bandaranaike's Party, which promised to make Ceylon a Republic outside the Commonwealth. In other words, the Ceylon ruling class, having freed itself from the control of the British ruling class after the war, is in no mood to retain the trappings of the British monarchy.

And once again the experts are proved wrong.

Chip that Buddha

When a ten-foot high Buddha was being moved by cane into a new temple in Bangkok recently it fell, and the plaster casing was chipped; beneath the casing the Buddha was seen to be made of gold (*Sunday Express*, 8-4-56). Now, it seems, the Buddhist temples of Siam are full of hurrying priests and laymen carrying hammer and chisel, purposefully bent on seeing whether their own



Buddhas conceal the same treasure-trove. Mingled with the prayers of the worshippers comes the sound of the gold-hungry faithful attacking their hitherto inviolate idols. Meanwhile, the original monks are finding that they struck a gusher; offerings to the golden Buddha are pouring in like a pool-entrant's dream, and already amount to nearly £20,000.

It is easy to sneer at these remarkable events; but surely there is here a message for us all. Beneath the outward show and doctrinal differences, we can find here a text on which both Christians and Buddhists obviously agree. What text?

To him that hath shall be given.

How revolutionary can you get?

It was suggested by a delegate at the Co-operative Party conference that no person should inherit more than £20,000 from any source (*Sunday Express*, 1-4-56). So instead of comparatively few big Capitalists, we should have a greater number of medium-sized Capitalists. What a suggestion with which to arouse the revolutionary fervour of the working class on the approach of May-Day!

ALWYN EDGAR.

THE MATTER WITH MARRIAGE

FORTY-FIVE years ago, only one marriage in 500 ended in divorce in this country. In 1954, 6.7 per cent.—nearly one in 15—went that way. The figure has risen inexorably, and the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce, which has just published its report, was set up in 1951 to enquire into the situation "having in mind the need to promote and maintain healthy and happy married life."

The trend is, in fact, world-wide. Britain's divorce rate is lower than those of France, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland. Highest of all is the U.S.A., and the lowest

figures, as would be expected, are for countries with large Catholic populations to whom divorce is forbidden: Canada, Belgium and Scotland. In addition, there is a steady smaller number of decrees of nullity and judicial separation. Most divorce petitions are granted: of 28,347, which were filed in Britain in 1954, only 1,094 failed to obtain decrees nisi.

Divorce had no legal existence a century ago. Before and after the Reformation, ecclesiastical courts dealt with matrimonial affairs and granted separations in exceptional cases, but there was no means of dissolving a

marriage. In the 18th and early 19th centuries it could be done by Private Act of Parliament; a procedure referred to by the Royal Commission of 1850 as "open . . . to anyone who was rich enough to pay for it." The first legislation allowing for the dissolution of marriage was the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1857. It permitted a husband to apply for divorce because of his wife's adultery; women were given no such facilities until 1923. And—despite another Royal Commission's recommendations—adultery remained virtually the sole ground for divorce until 1937, when desertion, insanity and cruelty were added.

The principle on which the current divorce law is founded is termed by the Commission "the doctrine of the matrimonial offence"; that is, the viewing of certain acts as being wholly incompatible with the accepted basis of a marriage. The alternative principle, urged by a number of people, is that of "breakdown of marriage," and any substantial alteration to the divorce law would mean introducing this. The Commission was not in favour of it, and its report is therefore disappointing to would-be reformers; apart from some minor recommendations, it provides simply a survey.

The Commission's explanations of the spread of divorce are familiar ones. They include housing difficulties, the emancipation of women, the loss of moral standards, the complexity of modern life and, most strongly emphasized of all, failure to take the responsibilities of marriage seriously. The remedies, in their view, are educating and encouraging the individual "to do his duty by the community" and increasing the facilities for "marriage guidance." In the entire Report, which is longer than most books, there is not a word concerning the real place of the family as an economic unit of society and the real reasons why its disintegration has become a social problem.

The Commission says: "The Western world has recognized that it is in the best interests of all concerned—the community, the parties to a marriage and their children—that marriage should be monogamous and that it should last for life." That may be so (though the fact that nearly half a million people in the Western world are obtaining divorces every year suggests that some of the Western world does not recognize it); in any case, it is not saying much. Society never recognized that marriage should be monogamous and life-lasting until it was monogamous. The fundamental, important point is that monogamy is one form of marriage; there have been others, each in accord with a different stage of human development, each with its own moral code showing clearly that it, too, has been "in the best interests of all concerned."

The monogamous family as it is ideally conceived belongs really to the Middle Ages, bound by tenure and tradition to its land or occupation. It was economically indissoluble—the reason why, on the surface, it was legally so. As an institution, it was carried on into industrialism. The status of the worker here was different, however: instead of being bound to his land, his village or his craft, he was now a "free" labourer. Thus, the family had remained but without its former economic ties: it had become dissoluble.

In fact, relatively few divorces were obtained by working people in the 19th century. For one thing, they were expensive! for another, the severely localized character of 19th-century industry made masses of workers dependent upon one town and one factory almost as feudal serfs had been on their land. Even until quite recent times, entire families worked in particular mills—

"their own"—in the cotton and woollen towns. Men grew up, met their wives and later sent their children to work in the same mill, and when that mill closed down they were unemployed until it was opened again.

The family has disintegrated simply because its economic function has changed; so, consequently, has traditional sexual morality. Morality is the code of behaviour which a society produces to safeguard its institutions, and when the institutions decline, so does the morality. Sexual morality has always aimed at keeping the family intact, and its lack of observance today is effect, not cause. The people to whom it remains vital are those whose status requires the careful maintenance of family life.

It is easy to quote figures and overlook that each one represents a person. Thirty thousand divorces (a year's yield in England) means 30,000 histories of unhappiness, and that is a horrifying thought. The Royal Commission speaks of "the complexity of modern life" which "multiplies the potential causes of disagreement and the possibilities of friction between husband and wife." It is not a Commission's, nor this article's function to give "human stories"; nevertheless, it is worth reflecting a moment on the things which society can do (that is what "the complexity of modern life" means) to two people who started full of fondness and desperately good intentions.

The individual failings and misfortunes which, in the Commission's view, cause unsuccessful marriages, are in reality facets of larger problems. The lack of adequate housing, the search for financial security at all costs, the refusal to have children—all are aspects of poverty. Harmony has a hard time in two rooms; equally, it lacks scope in a house with a high rent, instalments to pay, and a host of demands made by a society which "recognizes that marriage should be monogamous and that it should last for life." The Commission considers that much of the increase in divorce is because "many people can now get a divorce who could not get one before." That does not really improve the picture: it suggests, in fact, that there are many more unhappy marriages among people who, because of pride, respectability or religious belief (among many more reasons) still can't get one.

One other aspect of present-day marriage needs to be mentioned: the commercialism which pervades it as everything else in our world. The Royal Commission would have been nearer the point if they had mentioned the sale of canned illusions about marriage instead of complaining that people are too light-hearted about it. The modern young woman has been taught she hasn't a hope without the right perfume and the right foundation; the modern young man knows he must express himself in endearments from the film card-indexes; they both know that they need a contemporary bedroom suite, and they may not have the lolly of Miss Kelly and the Prince but they love each other just as much.

The problems involved are not ones which can be solved by amendments to existing legislation; the important thing is the social condition which leads to 30,000 divorces a year. Once, the monogamous family was a secure, unquestioned institution; changing economic conditions have taken its stability away and commercialized what is left, and the result is a lot of unhappiness for ordinary people who mostly never know what went wrong. The answer to this, as to all the other problems of the present day, is to establish a social basis on which neither the misery of poverty-stricken or ill-suited marriages nor the purposeless muck-raking of divorce suits can be founded.

The Royal Commission's function has been to consider what may be done to keep marriage going as an institution of property. Their assumptions about it were, as they say, "implicit in our terms of reference"; that is, they did the work they were told to do, and thus are unable to suggest a solution to the problems raised. See marriage as one institution among the property relationships of present-day society, and it becomes a different matter. The obvious and rational solution then is to do away with all those relationships—that is, with the Capitalist system itself—so that human happiness and not gain will be the sole motive of social organization.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

May Day, 1956 (May 6th). Plans have been made well in advance to ensure a successful May Day propaganda drive, by meetings and increased SOCIALIST STANDARD sales. This is just a last minute reminder to members to make every effort. Meetings are being held in Hyde Park, Conway Hall, London, Glasgow, Queen's Park and St. Andrews Halls, Nottingham; Market Square.

Conference went off very well indeed, with good attendances each day and the work was completed by 6 p.m. on the Sunday in time for the propaganda meeting held in Conway Hall.

Meeting on Russia. Conference recommended that a propaganda meeting should be held within a week or so to deal with events in Russia and to coincide with the visit to England of the Russian leaders. The E.C. agreed that we should go ahead and with the help of a few enthusiastic members. Denison House was booked for Sunday evening, April 15th (two weeks after Conference), the subject being "The New Retreat from Moscow). Comrades Darcy and Young are the speakers and Comrade Fahy in the chair. We hope to give a good report of this meeting in the next issue of the STANDARD.

Support of Outdoor Propaganda Meetings. We have stressed from time to time the need for active support of Party members at all outdoor meetings, active support

What can be said about relations between men and women in such a society is, as Engels says in "The Origin of the Family" (read it), "limited for the most part to what will disappear." Not much needs to be said, in any case: only that they will want each other as men and women, and not as housekeepers (which is only too true) or as dream-substitutes (which turns out disappointingly) or as highly-paid employees (which is what some of the better-to-do make of their wives and then are astonished when they behave as such).

R. COSTER.



being to arrive early, and if necessary put questions to the speakers in order to encourage the audience, and to be available to sell literature where possible and to back up the speaker should there be unruly elements in the audience. Speakers have reported to the Propaganda Committee that they need this support if meetings are to be run efficiently.

Fulham and Chelsea Branch report that their outdoor propaganda meetings at Gloucester Road Station on Wednesday evenings and at Earls Court Station on Friday evenings are continuing successfully. All members and sympathisers are welcome.

In response to Ealing Branch's appeal, the Branch intends to increase SOCIALIST STANDARD sales by four dozen copies in May. P.H.

CONSOLIDATE WHAT! MR. MACMILLAN?

THE recent pronouncements of Mr. MacMillan, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, ought to make working people wonder and inquire just what they are supposed to do to secure peace and prosperity in our time. After all no one can say they haven't done as they were told; the Labour Government introduced conscription as being necessary to keep peace; they complied. Under pressure, both economic and otherwise, they have worked all hours of the day and night; under both Tory and Labour Governments. High pressure advertising has persuaded them to commit themselves to long term payments on everything from washing machines to motor cars. Despite the long hours worked and the fact that many households have every member working, they still experience difficulty in buying the things they need; now they are told they have been living too well; they must consolidate. What have they got to consolidate? We would like to know!

When will working people realise the only thing they possess is their "labour power," that is their ability to labour at a trade, profession, or other tasks, menial or otherwise; for which they receive enough to keep them efficient in the job they are doing. Sometimes if they are well organised in "trade unions," and market conditions

are favourable, they may receive more; if, however, there is a surplus of workers for jobs they will most certainly receive less. Sugar is so much a pound, and workers are so much an hour, yet Capitalism talks of the dignity of labour; in that case the "stately homes" and sunny playgrounds in the South of France and elsewhere, where the rich spend much of their time, must be full of some very undignified people at this minute.

Socialists know the only way to solve the problems of to-day is to change the system of society.

It does not matter whether you have a Labour, Liberal, Conservative, or Communist Party Government, they are all doing the same job.

When the majority understand these things they will organise to introduce a new system of society, based on common ownership and democratic control of the means and methods of production and distribution by, and in, the interests of the whole community, irrespective of race, sex, or colour. Goods will be made for use and not for sale. There will be no trade, no barter, no buying, no selling. For everything will be the common property of all. Then there will be no production or distribution problems.

PHIL MELLOR.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," May, 1906.)

That Blessed Word Unity

WITH Easter come the Annual Conferences of those bodies which, with fine contempt for the meaning of words, call themselves Socialist, and with the conferences come also the customary demands, appeals and entreaties for unity. And, indeed, there is no real reason why these bodies should not unite, seeing that in practice they do not differ.

Socialist unity is achieved by membership of the S.P.G.B. . . . there is no reason why, if the members of these organisations desire Socialist unity, and not only the unity of non-Socialist Societies, and are prepared to adopt a Socialist attitude, they should not withdraw from their various separate bodies and enrol themselves with us. We only insist that they shall sign a declaration of adherence to the principles set out in column one of the front page of this journal and never depart from the position such adherence involves, even though the chances of "getting their man in" were never so rosy. Who then is for SOCIALIST unity?



"Putting all the policy-directives together, then, comrades, the party-line must be that for 25 years Russia was a workers' paradise ruled by a megalomaniac and mass-murderer."

FIFTY YEARS BEFORE THE ATOM BOMB

"I have no doubt," said Mons. Danyaz, "that a kilogramme of radium would be sufficient to destroy the population of Paris, granting that they came within its influence. Men and women would be killed just as easily as mice. They would feel nothing during their exposure to the radium, nor realise that they were in any danger, and weeks would pass after their exposure before anything would happen. Then gradually the skin would begin to peel off and their bodies would become one great sore. Then they would become blind. Then they would die from paralysis and congestion of the spinal cord." (Quoted by *The Morning Leader*, Monday, 11th January, 1904, in the Report from Paris of the discovery of Radium by Marie Curie from the *Strand Magazine*, January, 1904.)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD May, 1956

U.K. INDUSTRIAL GIANTS

Below are listed the 25 top companies in an analysis of the 100 biggest U.K. industrial undertakings with quoted share capital prepared by the National Institute of Economic and Social Research. The grading is based on 1953-54 asset values and 1954-55 assets and incomes are given for comparison. Oil companies are not included.

	1954-55	1954-55		1954-55	1954-55
	Assets	Income		Assets	Income
	£m.	£m.		£m.	£m.
I.C.I.	438	76.0	Ford Motor ...	62	23.2
Unilever	246	48.7	Gen. Electric ...	60	10.2
Imp. Tobacco...	171	31.2	United Steel ...	57	11.3
P. & O. Steam Navigation ...	127	18.9	Turner & Newall ...	53	15.7
Courtaulds	128	23.7	Cunard Steamship ...	49	7.3
Distillers	111	20.1	Tube Invests. ...	50	8.0
Steel Co. of Wales ...	99	14.3	Gt. Universal Stores ...	65	19.0
Dunlop Rbr....	89	17.8	British Motor Corpn. ...	56	21.2
Guest, Keen & Vickers ...	97	12.1	Brit. Insulated Cables ...	47	7.4
Nettlefolds ...	84	17.8	Rank Organisation ...	46	8.0
J. & P. Coats...	67	10.3	F. W. Woolworth ...	46	21.3
Assoc. Elec. Industries ...	663	15.1			
Bowater Paper ...	67	11.0			
Stewarts & Lloyds ...	59	15.0			

(Financial Times, 13.4.1956).

MARIE CURIE

The article on Marie Curie, the first part of which was published in our February issue, will be concluded in the June issue.

GROUPS

Will anybody interested in forming a Group or desiring any other information about Groups, apply to Group Secretary, at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD May, 1956

FULHAM BRANCH—LECTURES AND DISCUSSIONS

at
34, ST. GEORGE'S SQUARE, S.W.1

on
THURSDAY EVENINGS at 8 p.m.

May 3rd "Forced Labour in the U.S.S.R."—PETER E. NEWELL.

" 10th "Political Trends in Ireland"—A. FAHY.

" 17th "Women—Now and To-morrow"—LISA BRYAN.

" 24th "Socialism—A World Culture?"—JON KEYS.

" 31st "Socialism and Science"—F. WARLOW.

June 7th Title to be announced—C. WILSON.



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ...	3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m.
East Street (Walworth) ...	May 6th 11 a.m.
	" 13th 12.30 p.m.
	" 20th 11 a.m.
	" 27th 12.30 p.m.
Whitestone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

Station Road, Ilford ... 8 p.m.

SATURDAYS

Jolly Butchers Hill ... 7.30 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.
Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months (6 months, 2/9) for which 5/6 is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

MAY SALES DRIVE CANVASSES

FRIDAY, MAY 4th.	
(Meet) Hackney Town Hall ...	7.30 p.m.
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
SUNDAY, MAY 6th.	
(Meet) Stonebridge Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
Hackney Town Hall ...	11.00 a.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 8th.	
(Meet) South Acton Station ...	7.15 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 9th.	
(Meet) White City (Central Line Station) ...	7.15 p.m.
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
FRIDAY, MAY 11th.	
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
Hackney Town Hall ...	7.30 p.m.
SUNDAY, MAY 13th.	
St. Margaret's, Twickenham. Meet (Mogden Lane) ...	10.45 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 15th.	
White City (Central Line Station) ...	7.15 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 16th.	
Shepherds Bush (Met. Station) ...	7.15 p.m.
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
FRIDAY, MAY 18th.	
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
Regal Cinema, Mare Street, Hackney ...	7.30 p.m.
SUNDAY, MAY 20th.	
Finsbury Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 23rd.	
St. Margaret's, Twickenham. Meet Mogden Lane ...	7.15 p.m.
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MAY 24th.	
Hounslow Central Station ...	7.15 p.m.
FRIDAY, MAY 25th.	
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.
Regal Cinema, Mare Street, Hackney ...	7.30 p.m.
SUNDAY, MAY 27th.	
Stonebridge Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station ...	10.45 a.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 29th.	
East Acton Station ...	7.15 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 30th.	
Camberwell Green ...	8.00 p.m.

(Further information obtainable from Literature Canvassing Committee at Head Office.)

ANNUAL MAY DAY RALLY AT HYDE PARK on SUNDAY 6th MAY from 3 p.m.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day ...	1/- (Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
Russia Since 1917 ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis ...	1/- (" " 1/2)
Socialism ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Socialism or Federal Union? ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism? ...	4d. (" " 6d.)
Nationalisation or Socialism? ...	6d. (" " 8d.)

All obtainable from the Literature Committee, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 9th and 23rd May, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

INDOOR RALLY AT CONWAY HALL, RED LION SQUARE, W.C.1.

SUNDAY, 6th MAY, at 7.30 p.m.

"POLITICAL MATURITY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM"

Speakers: R. COSTER and W. READ

Questions and Discussion. All welcome.

HACKNEY BRANCH DISCUSSIONS

at
CO-OP HALL, 197, MARE STREET, HACKNEY, E.9
on

MONDAY EVENINGS at 8 p.m.

May 7th "Prices and Wages—Inflation"—E. HARDY.

"14th "The Brothers Karamazov"—P. LAWRENCE

"21st "Prices and Wages—Do High Wages Cause
High Prices?"—E. HARDY.

Buses: 6, 106, 170, 555, 557, 653 and 677.

Questions and Discussion. All welcome.

GLASGOW BRANCHES MAY DAY RALLY

SUNDAY, MAY 6th

Queen's Park (Recreation Ground) in the Afternoon
St. Andrews Hall, Berkeley St., in the Evening 7.30 p.m.
All welcome.

NOTTINGHAM BRANCH MAY DAY MASS MEETING

Market Square, Nottingham

SUNDAY, 6th MAY at 3 p.m.

Speakers: J. GARNHAM, J. KEYS, F. WARLOW.

Questions invited.

ISLINGTON BRANCH LECTURE

on

WEDNESDAY, 9th MAY at 8 p.m.

at

CO-OP HALL, 129, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7

"Ireland Through the Eyes of a Socialist"—A. FAHY.

Questions and Discussion. All welcome.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD May, 1956

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (3rd, 17th and 31st May).

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reeve Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCELS meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHelsea. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, G.3.

GLASGOW (Kilvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 7th and 21st May, at 8 p.m., at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.5.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (9th and 23rd May) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

LEYTON Branch meets Mondays 8.0 p.m., at Trades Hall, Grove House, High Road, Leyton, E.10. Lectures and Discussions held 2nd and 4th Monday in each month. Secretary, D. Russell, c/o H.O., 32, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 8th and 22nd May, George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st and 3rd Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form on previous page.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- * Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- * Submit names for sample copies.
- * Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- * Get libraries to display the S.S.
- * Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 622 Vol. 52 June, 1956

DON'T BE SIDETRACKED
BY AUTOMATION

DRESSED UP FOR WHAT?

THE PASSING SHOW

MARIE CURIE

THE MOSLEY MOVEMENT


STALIN IN ECLIPSE

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

4

The Wild West The Myth and the Reality



IN THIS RAPIDLY CHANGING WORLD, the form of entertainment indulged in by the majority of the population in the industrialized countries has undergone many changes in the last 50 years. Not only have the forms of dancing, popular music, films and literature changed, but the fictional character also.

There is, however, one familiar figure who has been our constant companion on the screen and bookstall during all these years. In silent "flicks," talkies, colour, Three-D, Cinemascope, he still remains the same—long, lean and sun-tanned; with Stetson hat and pistols, his mount well-groomed—our old and ever-popular friend, the Cowboy.

Popular Appeal

To the densely-herded urban masses whose wide-open spaces are confined at best to a small suburban garden (or for the less fortunate, a cactus in a flower-pot), the unrestricted country of the American West has a vast appeal.

It is probably the fictional Westerner's apparent freedom that is the real attraction. Our celluloid and paper-pulp hero spends his time destroying the forces of evil, be they represented as Indians, rustlers or land-grabbers. He is gallant with the ladies, and never fails to defend or restore legally-owned property. Sometimes he is on the wrong side of the law, forced into this position by some

ruthless landowner, or a victim of the financiers' guile. In spite of these lawless trends, however, our hero's basic goodness still shines through. Faced with this dilemma in their hero, the film producers' usual way out is to get him conveniently killed.

Modern man is generally tied down to one job, often tedious and uninteresting. The Westerner is aloof from this. He never seems to be very closely tied to any full-time occupation, even when he dons the uniform of the U.S. Cavalry. To imagine oneself able to undertake any adventure, or punish any infamy, is a wonderful escape from punching the time-clock.

The Western film or story has generally a twofold approach. One shows a desire for justice and for the removal of tyranny. The other depicts violence and quick action as opposed to thought and reasoned movement. The stories are seldom complicated. The viewer or reader does not have to rack his brain over subtle psychological mysteries or unpleasant social problems. The stories are easy to write and the films cheap to produce. They are ideal products for a mass market.

A Glimpse into the Past

At this point, let us look at the birthplace of these modern legends, and roll back the years.

The term "West" in American history covered each stage of the frontier as it moved towards the Pacific from the early Atlantic seaboard settlements. We take up the story when that frontier had reached the Mississippi River.

It was the Spaniards who first moved up into what are now Texas, New Mexico and California, and explored the Mississippi. They built churches, mission stations and settlements. At the same time the French were moving along the Great Lakes and the rivers from Canada and extending over the plains to the Rockies. A few were priests, but the majority were fur-trappers and traders. These latter mixed freely with the wandering Indian tribes.

The English were the next settlers, consolidating and developing as they went. In time they came to represent a new rising Capitalist class, viewing the New World as something more than just a possession of an overseas absolute monarch.

Francis Parkman who, in 1846, journeyed from Kansas over the Oregon Trail to the foot of the Rockies, mixed with the Indians and noted their habits. In his journal he writes at length about the French trappers and trail-blazers and their inter-marriage with the Indians. He noted something else that was to have a more important effect on history—the settlers' wagons heading for Oregon and California, Mormons striking out into the wilderness to found a new home in Utah, the adventurous seeking the new-found gold. America was in the process of making another frontier.

Expansion

The United States, having purchased Louisiana and secured Florida, was still faced with a foreign power in the south-west. In 1821 Mexico had become independent of Spain, and the lands over the Rio Grande passed to her. Land could be purchased in Texas for 12½ cents per acre, or one-tenth of the price that the U.S. Government charged for land. Within a few years about 20,000 Americans, mostly southerners, moved into Texas. A smaller number travelling by sea had secured land in California.

Mexico had officially abolished slavery, but the newcomers, fresh from the slave-owning south, had no wish

to become peasants. Hired labour was rare, so Mexico looked the other way. The rapid changes of Mexican government made the Texans uncertain of the status of their slave property. In 1835, Santa Anna abrogated certain states' rights (this included Texas) and these economic and political struggles led to the Texans' declaring a provisional government. Some 200 of them were besieged and slaughtered in the fortified mission-station of the Alamo, but the siege gave time for the Texans under Houston to form an army and get support from the U.S. Houston avenged the Alamo by capturing Santa Anna and destroying the Mexican Army.

The final result was that the lands north of the Rio Grande were annexed. Five new states were formed in the Union, and all except California were declared slave states. They were, however, too lightly populated and unsuited for one-main-crop agriculture to be affected by that form of property. The growing industrial north did feel, however, that the Mexican War had given more power to the slave-owning south.

The Self-made Man

The rapid expansion of America in the west brought great personal opportunities. A land that had no old-established ruling class flung up its new Capitalists and developers from among those of humble birth. Individualism or, better still, individual property rights became the order of the day.

The man, who through luck and resource, amassed money was a being to be looked up to. Not being tied down with the ideas of aristocracy, making money and not how it was made, was the new Capitalist ethic. The Press slated those who returned from the West to a somewhat less lucrative but probably more secure life in the East. Failure was against the nation and the destiny of America.

In the new areas the State machine was weak, and weakened further by the great regard for property. Nothing must stand in the way of the "go-getter." There was little restraining influence on wealth or the way it was secured. Laws tended to be flouted openly when they stood in the way of personal advance.

The Gold Rush

In 1848 gold was discovered in California, and before long the country was over-run with prospectors. Whereas in other areas the settlers followed hunters and turned the land under the plough and spade, in California the principal attraction was gold. Mostly the newcomers came by ship, round Cape Horn, or broke the journey by the short overland route through Panama, but some crossed the continent by wagon, a long and most dangerous journey. Wandering Indians and the hot, arid desert valleys were but two of the problems to be faced. The wagon train scout, Wm. Manley, reported graphically of these emigrants' torments.

San Francisco became the centre of the Barbary Coast and, as was to be expected in a gold-rush community, catered for every vice. At this time in the settlement only two per cent. of the population were women, and to meet the shortage boatloads of ladies of uncertain virtue were sent out from the eastern states and from Europe. The reader can get some idea of the turbulence when he considers that from 1848 to 1856 there were some 1,200 murders and only three official hangings in the San Francisco area, especially as the population only numbered some 20,000. California, not deriving its wealth from the slaves or the soil, developed what was in fact a new financial and Capitalist outlook.

Pike's Peak and Oscar Wilde

Another gold rush started in 1858, when gold was discovered in the Pike's Peak area of Colorado. The same stream of wagons, with some prospectors even pushing their belongings on handcarts, creaked across the plains. It was in this area that Horace Tabor, "the Bonanza King," arose; living in splendour, he even built an opera-house in Leadville. To this flamboyant and noisy setting came, on a brief visit, the prince of aesthetes, Oscar Wilde, who declared the miners to be "Capital fellows, and not at all rough."

One settlement that stands out from all the rest was the Mormon headquarters at Salt Lake City. They built a city in the wilderness after many hardships, a town that in many ways was an example to others springing up at this time. They showed how a group of people with a strong communal sense could accomplish a more stable way of living than the purely individualistic elements.

The War

When the Civil War broke out, the Confederate South counted on support from the Mid-west, principally on the point that these areas had always used the Mississippi as an outlet and the Confederates controlled the sea outlet of New Orleans. The Confederates overlooked the railways: the West could now link up directly with the industrial eastern states, and so the economic grip of "Old Muddy" was broken.

The Pacific States being so far from Washington, there was always the threat of secession from the Union. Representatives from these states had to make a long sea voyage round America; only the hardy and the poor attempted the covered wagon overland route. The North, aware of these problems, speeded up the railway programme. In 1869 the two lines met at Ogden, Utah. The gap was filling in, the wilderness was being conquered.

The Mid-west prospered because of the War, and by the fact that England and the rest of Europe had bad harvests in the 1860s. Industrialization was creating a new market to be satisfied, and exports of foodstuffs increased.

The Coming of the Cowboy

In the vast central area called the Great Plains, settlements were few and far between. Towns sprang up round the mining camps, and it was these places that dominated the scene. The Plains were not considered to be of much use other than for Indians and hunting. They were areas that wagons passed through, but not to settle; the gold and the sunny fertile valleys of the Pacific were the main attraction. Here, on these plains and deserts, was America's last frontier.

Texas and the south-west had always been a cattle-raising country, at least near the Rio Grande, wavy back in Spanish times. It was in these lands that the Vaquero or Cowboy lived and learned his trade. The Cowpuncher was a man who worked in the railway stockyards as a grader and loader, and later the name was applied to all ranch workers.

As a result of Texas joining the Confederates in the Civil War, she was cut off from the sea and the Mississippi by the Union forces. A surplus of cattle resulted, as there was no market available. Faced with ruin after the war, like so many other cattle-men Joseph McCoy conceived the idea of driving the sellable surplus cattle along the Chisholm trail to Abilene, thence by rail to Kansas and the eastern states. The cattle could live on the herbage that fed bison; it was just a question of linking-up with water courses and holes. This was the commence-

ment of the great cattle-drives that still figure so much in the cinema and magazines.

The increased industrialization of America and Europe led to a need for more and more meat. Profits went up, and it became the age of the cattle kings and the cowboy, owners of great herds like Chisum and Kennedy. This period of the fictional saga was not very long in fact, yet it has provided thrills and entertainment for millions since that time.

By 1871 some 600,000 head of cattle were driven to various points north from Texas, and the idea caught on. Cattle-raising and driving spread right up to Montana.

The cattle kings, like the miners, brought wealth to many small towns, but like them it was sometimes transient. The ranchworkers, miners and settlers who worked hard and were often isolated for long periods tended to get together whenever possible. If they were in a religious mood, then large camp meetings were held, at which fervour and emotions ran riot. At the other extreme, the saloon played quite a part in the growing towns. People who were often without the means to create or study tended to "bust loose" in town. These saloons provided drink and refreshment, women, gamblers, bullies and thugs, and the social get-together.

It is in this cattle age that we find the now almost legendary figures of the West. The sheriffs and bad men, like the Earp Brothers, "Bat" Masterton, Sam Brown, Plummer and Frank Loving, not forgetting the old favourites Wild Bill Hickock and Buffalo Bill. Some of these characters would have been better confined to the pathological ward.

The end of the frontier was near, however. At Abilene, T. C. Henry sowed "winter wheat" and it was a success. The plains could now be turned under the plough, and settlers moved in in great numbers. From this arose the struggle between the ranchers and settlers, the battle between the unfenced range and the boundary wire. By the 1880-90s, improved agriculture and grass-lands, as well as improved stock and irrigation, won the day. The ever-spreading railways killed the "big drive" and the "Lead Steer." The vast open range was out; it was no longer good business to wander for days looking for grass and water. Output could be increased in a smaller space. The mines also were being grouped into large concerns, and the prospector became a mine-worker.

The Redskin

It is as well we take a brief glimpse at the original occupant of this land, the Indian. Small in numbers, therefore of no great use to the slave-owner or the farmer and industrialist, he was generally regarded as a form of dangerous vermin. Whatever the Abolitionist may have said about the evils of slavery, or what tears he may have wept over the Negro, he certainly never extended these sentiments to the Indian.

The Redskins' main source of food was the bison, herds of which often covered the plains for miles. The settlers, the railways, sportsmen and Government policy soon reduced the bison to a few thousands. The Government thought this would keep the Indians tied to their reserves, make them devote more of their time to agriculture, and cease their wanderings and tribal warfare. Unfortunately for the Indians, the reserves got smaller and the game for food less and less. People with a Stone Age culture, they found it hard to grasp what was happening. At one time a number of them, so disturbed by the numbers of trains and wagons passing over their land, pathetically tried to go east because they thought everyone had left there.

Attacks on Indian camps by soldiers were by no means unusual. This is a point that the film moguls generally omit from the typical "western." In 1876, for example, a Colonel Reynolds attacked a Sioux camp at Powder River and burnt it out, the temperature at the time being 40 degrees below zero. The Indian braves counter-attacked and drove the soldiers away. These incidents caused a great meeting of the Sioux tribe, Cheyennes and Arapahoes on the Little Big Horn, under Sitting Bull and Two Moon. It was this gathering that defeated General Custer, an incident that the ardent Western fan must have seen portrayed many times. Indian risings occurred all the way down to Mexico. Like the Mau-Mau of our own time, the Indian terrorists' tactics did not tend to improve their position or gain them much sympathy.

The Apache War of 1883-85 is the one in which the famous Geronimo took part. With 35 men and over 100 women and children he engaged 50,000 U.S. troops, 500 Indian scouts and a hostile armed populace as well as the soldiers of Mexico for about 18 months before surrendering.

The last violent uprising came rather late. A prophetic dream and ritual dance having its origin in a Nevada reserve soon spread among the Indians. Some

350 Sioux deserted their Dakota reserve. U.S. cavalry intercepted them and under Hotchkiss guns as protection started to disarm them. A chief began the ritual ghost dance and donned his war-bonnet. The immediate fighting resulted in the deaths of some 200 Indians and 60 soldiers. Thus ended once and for all any attempt by the Indians to get their problems solved by violence. Properly-defined reserves and infiltration into the mass of the population with their many trades and occupations soon left the Indians as living museum-pieces.

The development of America, like the advance of industrialization in Africa and Asia, is one of the principal aspects of Capitalist society. The old tribal organizations are broken up by the unstemmed tide of investment for profit. Capitalism, now more or less universal, likes to look back on some aspect of its earlier days. From the American viewpoint, the glorification of the early West does just this.

One point the magazine and film producers seldom show is that a large land mass was brought under cultivation and development in a fairly short space of time by people who, generally, were far removed from the much boosted and vaunted violence so usual a feature of their films and stories.

J. LAW.

DRESSED UP—FOR WHAT?

It was a pleasant evening in early summer, still quite light, warm and balmy, the air laden with the scent of flowers from the park across the way. For what was normally a busy London suburb, there was surprisingly little traffic and this lent an atmosphere of tranquility—something all too rare nowadays.

Then I saw him. He was standing in a shop doorway, a well built young man of about 23, handsome in a coarse way, and one who obviously took great care of his appearance. From his thick, brushed hair to his gleaming shoes, he was a picture of smartness, reminding one of the photographs appearing in male fashion magazines—but without the usual smile.

For he was not smiling. He stared moodily out at passers by, and when I passed the same spot an hour and a half later, on my way home, he was still there, talking to no-one, the same chap—the same expression of unrelieved boredom.

You may wonder at the conditions which drive a young person to take such trouble with his dress and appearance, all to no apparent purpose, and yet he is no exception. The story could be repeated many times over. Just take a look at the Broadways of any large town or suburb and see the boys and girls attempting to express their individuality via the medium of dress, hair style, etc., only to achieve, at best, a variation of a very narrow theme.

A friend of the writer once pointed out a mutual acquaintance with the words "Guess how much that suit cost?—£40!"—which can tell us quite a lot about the standard of values in the modern world. The clothes made the man as far as this youngster was concerned. No one of course denies that good clothes are a pleasure to wear, and it is a rarity nowadays to see young men walking around with the seats of their trousers tattered and worn—as was the lot of many before the war. (Although even the smartness of our doorway friend pales



a little when one considers what is available to those with real money). But Capitalism never gives with one hand without taking away with the other.

"Full employment" we may have. We also have the frustration on the faces of the gum-chewing girls and

boys, which sooner or later expresses itself in violence. The Broadways mentioned earlier will provide ample evidence of this on any Saturday night around midnight when the local dance halls turn out—and so does the local police van.

Areas which were considered "respectable" before the war are no longer so. The "Teddy Boy" problem has pushed its way into the least expected places and stubbornly resists orthodox attempts to solve it. And who can wonder? It is, after all, part of the price we pay for modern life with its feverish nightmare existence and its failure to give deep and lasting satisfaction. The obvious bad effects on the minds and bodies of so many are typified in the pathetic young man in the shop doorway and the Saturday night sorties of the "Bobbies."

"Relaxation is all important," says Dr. W. Clunie Harvey, M.D., D.P.H., writing in the journal *Better Health* (April 1955), but it becomes increasingly difficult

in a world where, to quote Dr. Clunie again, "We are very often born in a hurry, we tear through childhood, before we know we're grown up we are getting on towards middle age. . . . Our lives seem to be made up of a series of crises. No sooner do we get out of one than we find ourselves in another. . . ."

Which just about sums it up. Capitalism can offer us very little else but a "series of crises" of one sort or another. It has been said, no doubt with some truth, that the dress style and the nonchalant air of the street corner boys and their made-up girl friends is but an effort to assert themselves against a future which they subconsciously dread. We can only work for the day when this is replaced with a conscious appreciation of the cause of their fears, and the realisation that only Socialism can give them the security they crave.

E.T.C.

THE PASSING SHOW

The last days of Gwaen-cae-Gurwen

The village of Gwaen-cae-Gurwen lies in a valley among the peaceful hills of South Wales. It runs no risks from volcanoes or other forces of nature. And yet, if the National Coal Board carries out its declared intention, Gwaen-cae-Gurwen will be destroyed as surely as Mount Vesuvius destroyed Pompeii.

The National Coal Board, like any other Capitalist board of directors, thirsts after profit. But it took over coalmines which private Capitalism had bled white; much investment must be made before the mines can become profitable again. In the meantime, some pits, because of such geological conditions as faulting in the seams, lose more money than others. And because of such geological conditions, there are more disputes between masters and men at such pits over proper rates of pay. Strikes occur, men are dismissed because the management say they are employing "go-slow" tactics, bitterness increases; and this in its turn leads to more disputes.

Among such pits are the East and Steer pits at Gwaen-cur-Gurwen. Over a thousand men from the village work there. There is no alternative employment nearer than Margam steelworks, 20 miles away. Gwaen-cur-Gurwen lives because it works at the two collieries.

And on May 11th last the National Coal Board gave 14 days' notice to all the miners at the two pits. It intends to close both of them because "continued restrictions of effort, lack of co-operation by the workmen, and low productivity" have resulted in serious financial losses. (*The Times*, 12/5/56).

Those who extol the merits of the British ruling class say that in Britain no one is punished without a fair trial and conviction. But here is punishment—and what punishment is more severe than deprivation of livelihood?—without trial, without even individual accusation; it is group punishment, for which the British ruling class condemned the German rulers in the last war—making all suffer for the supposed faults of some.

Wasted Effort

But apart from that, how clearly the action of the N.C.B. demonstrates the position of the workers under Capitalism, Private or State. The worker is employed by the kind consent of the Capitalist; when the Capitalist no longer wants him, he casts him out; and the worker

must crawl away until he finds some other property-owner who will make a profit out of employing him. In such a case as Gwaen-cae-Gurwen, the worker must cut his family ties, and perhaps leave the village where he was born, before he can find other work.

What a tragedy is here! Troy was taken and wiped out by enemy soldiers, hiding in a wooden horse which the enemies of Troy had built. But Gwaen-cae-Gurwen is to be destroyed by the National Coal Board, for the creation of which no one worked harder, or sacrificed himself more eagerly, than the South Wales miner. Capitalism, whatever it is called, does not change its nature; the National Coal Board is preparing to offer up Gwaen-cae-Gurwen as a tribute to the great god Profit with as little compunction as private Capitalists could have shown.

Gambling—selective criticism

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England, the Congregational Assembly—all join in condemning Mr. MacMillan's new premium bond scheme. The scheme, they say roundly, constitutes government encouragement of the practice of gambling. But not a word from the reverend archbishop, or from the august assemblies, about the great gamble which is the Stock Exchange. Which is not surprising. The Church of England is doing very well from its speculations upon the Stock Exchange; and all churches realize, consciously or sub-consciously, that their function in present-day society is to allay any discontent among the masses by promising a rosy future in the sky; and to draw attention to the activities of the ruling class, upon the Stock Exchange and elsewhere, is not the best way to perform that task. So while the churches criticise some forms of gambling, they keep quiet about other and more serious, kinds.

Mass deportation

At the conferences among the victorious war-chiefs at the end of the second world war it was agreed that eastern Germany, beyond the Oder and the Neisse, should be given to Poland to compensate her for territories she had to give up to Russia. As was foreseen, Poland deported the millions of Germans living in this part of Germany, and repopulated the territory with displaced Poles. As the knowledge of this atrocity—surely one of

the most gigantic "war-crimes" committed by either side—spread, the western allies tried, by undignified squirming, to put all the blame on Russia. Russia, of course, must bear her share of the blame, but not all of it.

But not all of our "leaders" have abandoned mass deportation as an answer to the problems of Capitalism. Step forward, Mr. R. T. Paget, Q.C., M.P. Mr. Paget believes that mass deportation of the Cypriots to Greece would solve the Cyprus problem. He wrote to *The Times* on April 27th:

"Whenever an act of terrorism takes place and no information is forthcoming from the locality, then compulsory purchase orders should be served on all Greek property owners in that locality and the inhabitants should be deported to Greece. . . . The ships that deported the Greeks would return with Turks who would purchase and settle in the property we had acquired from the Greeks."

"This process," Mr. Paget writes blandly, "would continue until there was a Turkish majority or until terrorism stopped." Mr. Paget, as becomes a leading supporter of Capitalism, leaves out of the reckoning any question of the human suffering this would entail, the merits of punishing all for the faults of some, and the justice—even by Capitalist standards—of deporting people from an island where they and their forbears have lived for hundreds of years. It only remains to add that Mr. Paget is a prominent member of the Labour Party, which claims to be devoted to increasing the sum of human happiness.

Queensbury Rules

Another Labourite, and former M.P., Tom Driberg,

also has some comments to offer upon the Cyprus situation. Unlike Mr. Paget, Mr. Driberg believes that "when government degenerates into tyranny . . . violent resistance is legitimate" (*Reynolds News*, 13-5-56). He goes on:

"Violent resistance, however, should have its code of decency. Attacks should be directed primarily against enemy installations—camps, airfields, stores of weapons, radio-stations. It is wrong to throw bombs into married quarters, to shoot soldiers off duty, shopping with their families."

The code which Mr. Driberg offers for the guidance of the EOKA resistance in Cyprus is not the code which the British forces pursued in the last war, with no protest from Mr. Driberg. Bombs were not only thrown but dropped in large quantities into every kind of quarters; British soldiers and airmen did not stop to enquire whether the Germans they killed were soldiers off duty, or indeed whether they were soldiers at all. If Mr. Driberg thinks so much of his code, he should have offered it to the public earlier, during the last war, when he was in Parliament.

As for Socialists, they have nothing to do either with bomb-throwing Cypriots or schoolboy-flogging Britons. The issue being fought out in Cyprus is this: are the Cypriot workers, Greek and Turkish, to be exploited by a British ruling class or a Greek ruling class? The Socialist attitude to Cyprus is the same as the Socialist attitude to every other part of the world; abolish Capitalism, which subsists on exploitation and leads to bloodshed and establish Socialism.

ALWYN EDGAR.

MARIE CURIE

(Continued from February Issue)

ONCE the actual existence of Radium was proved a series of astounding developments followed. Taken up rapidly by the research workers of the world, its endless applications were, at first, but dimly appreciated.

Medical men tried it in the treatment of cancer, and scored successes. Pierre exposed his arm to it and received a painful burn. In 1903, Rutherford and Soddy, working on Marie's hypothesis, published their "Theory of Radioactive Transformation," the theory that elements thought unchangeable are in spontaneous evolution. Radium gave out heat, affected other substances, pierced solid objects, and was luminous. Radium became "big business." A factory was started in France. Enquiries came from all over the world. At last the inevitable one arrived from America by a concern in Buffalo, requesting information on the production of Radium, and suggesting contracts for payment of license fees. For this it would have been necessary for the Curies to stake their claim: to patent their "invention" and maintain secrecy in its processes. In reply to her husband's request as to whether they should declare themselves the "proprietors" of Radium Marie replied (as Faraday and Pasteur had done before her):

"It is impossible. It would be contrary to the scientific spirit."

The information required was given FREE to EVERYBODY.

November, 1903, marked the first real turning point in the Curies' fortune. The Swedish Academy of Science decided to award them half the Nobel Prize in Physics. This amounted to about 70,000 francs, "for us, a huge sum."

After this, the University of Paris had to create a chair in physics for Pierre Curie.

More than this, he was officially allowed three paid assistants, and the chief of lab. nominated Madame Curie. The first woman to be thus accorded official recognition—the first woman to be admitted to the Royal Institution in London—and the first woman scientist of world rank, winner of the Nobel Prize. Pierre and Marie applied themselves to the new life. Both continued teaching as before.

Life was a little easier now. But, as is so often the case, Fate waited in the background to drown content in the cup of sorrow.

On April 19th, 1906, Pierre Curie was leaving his publishers on the way to the Institute of Science, when he was run down by a heavy dray, the rear wheel passed over his head; one of the greatest brains in the world ceased to think. The 20 foot wagon was loaded with military uniforms.

The Government proposed to award Madame Curie and her children a State pension, which she indignantly refused.

The University naturally desired to retain Marie in its faculty. But how! It was finally decided that there was only one physicist capable of replacing Pierre Curie—Marie—his widow. This was the first time that a post in higher education was given to a woman.

When the time came for her to start her course—the hushed and tense audience heard her opening sentence with amazement. She started at the exact point where her late husband had concluded a year before. Finally, an agreement was made between Dr. Row, of the Pasteur Institute and the University of Paris for the

foundation of the Institute of Radium, under the direction of Marie Curie.

By this time, the honours, medals and prizes, showered upon her by the world's scientific bodies ran into hundreds; filling several printed pages. She was the only woman to be awarded the Nobel Prize twice. And so she went steadily on, instructing her pupils, continuing to direct research until the first world war, when she organised an X-ray Unit, which utilised the electrical knowledge she had discovered.

Finally, she died in 1934, but not until she had made several triumphal tours to the United States, her native Warsaw, and the Far East.

Eleanor Dooley in her Puffin Books little sketch "The Radium Woman," tells the story of the attempts by Mrs Melmay to persuade the wealthy American women to give ten thousand dollars each to buy the discoverer of radium one gramme of it to permit her to continue her researches. Only three could be found. A subscription fund among the women of America raised the amount in less than a year. This gramme of radium was presented to her at the White House by the President of the United States.

What is it that makes these two—Marie, and her husband Pierre, such lovable and attractive characters. Not their scientific prowess, not their almost superhuman concentration on the job to be done. No! Above all their self-effacing modesty, and refusal to assume superiority, Pierre's firm refusal to accept decorations, their avoidance of publicity, and renunciation of personal wealth. Not once, but several times, they turned down fortunes. They just wanted to work at the job they had chosen.

As Marie wrote later:—

"Pierre Curie was little inclined to take an active part in politics."

"By education and feeling he was attached to democratic and socialist ideas, but he was dominated by no party doctrine."

Pierre himself wrote at the beginning of their acquaintance

"It would be a fine thing to pass our lives near to each other, hypnotised by our dreams, your patriotic dream, our humanitarian dream, and our scientific dream. Of all those dreams the last is, I believe, the only legitimate one."

I mean by that, that we are powerless to change the social order, and, even if we were not, we should not know what to do in taking action, no matter in what direction, we should never be sure of not doing more harm than good by retarding some inevitable evolutions. From the scientific point of view, on the contrary, we may hope to do something, the ground is solid here and any discovery we may make, however small, will remain acquired knowledge."

When the newspaper correspondents of two continents were rapping on their front door, they would slide off through the back on their bicycles. To-day it is fashionable to blame scientists for the existence of the Hydrogen bomb, and if we are consistent, nobody should be blamed more than Marie Curie, whose discovery of natural radium made the manufacture of artificial isotopes (radio-active substances) possible.

Nothing could be more absurd. Pierre abhorred violence in every form. Both worked for humanity. If she is to be blamed for Atomic bombs, let her be praised for nuclear reactors. Film companies and magazine owners have made fortunes from their story. An aura

of "romantic" legend has been fabricated around it. Marie herself debunked it in the clearest terms.

"It is true that the discovery of radium was made in precarious conditions; the shed which sheltered it seems clouded in the charms of legend. But this romantic element was not an advantage; it wore out our strength and delayed our accomplishment. With better means, the first five years of our work might have been reduced to two, and their tension lessened."

They paid the price for their discovery in ruined health.

Until radium became a saleable commodity nobody wanted to know, they could kill themselves, just two more screwy cranks. When there was money in it, how the letters poured in! Kings and Presidents rushed to shake their hands, award them medals, and toast their honour.

And yet when Marie was invited back to Warsaw 24 years later at the opening of the Warsaw Institute of Radium, she spotted at a banquet in her honour a tiny white-haired old lady, Mde. Sikorska, her teacher at the boarding school she attended when a tot. Straightway the sincere unaffected Marie made her way down the tables to take her first teacher by the hands, and kiss her cheeks.

The atomic weight of Radium was announced in 1904. This year saw the birth of the Socialist Party in Great Britain. It was in that year, after nearly three years of exhausting drudgery, that Marie asked Pierre, after the children were put to bed, to go with her down to the damp and dingy old shed which housed their works.

Opening the door and peering through the darkness they saw the queer phosphorescent gleam of a grain of pure radium, the supposedly indestructible molecules of matter were actually seething systems of whirling electrons in exploding atoms.

Until the birth of the Socialist idea, and its realisation into a Party, the Capitalist system seemed indestructible too.

Socialism, in the realm of ideas, like radium in the physical world, gleamed with an inextinguishable glow, and affected those it contacted with a political "radio-activity."

To Socialists the work of Marie Curie will always epitomise the struggle of the people for knowledge and freedom.

Like those other martyrs of the battle, the heroic Communards of her beloved Paris, she will be forever "enshrined in the great heart of the working class."

In actual numbers, or sheer physical size, the early S.P.G.B. roughly corresponded with the proportion of radium in pitch-blende, one to the million.

HORATIO.

Books "Madame Curie," by Eve Curie, Heinemann, "The Radium Woman," by Eleanor Dooley, Puffin Books.

"UP—AND DOWN!"

"If the unpaid labour supplied by the working-class and accumulated by the Capitalist class, increases so rapidly that its conversion into capital requires an extraordinary addition of paid labour, then wages rise, and, all other circumstances remaining equal, the unpaid labour diminishes in proportion. But as soon as this diminution touches the point at which the surplus-labour that nourishes capital is no longer supplied in normal quantities, a reaction sets in; a smaller part of revenue is capitalised, accumulation lags, and the movement of rise in wages receives a check. The rise of wages, therefore, is confined within limits that not only leave intact the foundations of the capitalistic system, but also secure its reproduction on a progressive scale" ("Capital," Karl Marx, Vol. 1, Chap. 25, page 680 Kerr Edw.).

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JUNE



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

DON'T BE SIDETRACKED BY AUTOMATION

THE 20-year-old word Automation, which was designed to describe automatic processes involving electronic devices but is now being loosely applied to any replacement of human labour by machinery, is being used to divert workers' attention from the matters that ought to concern them. What matters to the workers of all countries, and ought to receive their undivided attention, is not what kinds of machines are used to turn out goods but who owns the machines and who owns the goods. If we lived in a system of society based upon common ownership of the means of production and distribution nobody would have cause to fear the introduction of more efficient methods. No individual would suffer hardship through the abolition of his job and all people would gain through the greater production of wealth. But all countries in the world operate Capitalism and it is Capitalism not the machines that creates the problems and hardships for the men and women who work the machines. This aspect is entirely ignored by all except Socialists.

Many defenders of Capitalism, worried by the resistance organised workers are showing to the new production methods, are trying to counter it by stories of the better times that will come after the hardships. The *Daily Mail* in an editorial (3 May, 1956), had the following about what it calls the spirit of "anti-automation":—

"It results from fear of the robot—the thought that men skilled and unskilled alike, will become redundant when their work can be done by the press-button and the electronic brain. We must all sympathise with this feeling. In the long run automation will mean a stupendous rise in standards of living."

There is no evidence whatever to justify this promise of a stupendous rise in standards of living for the workers,

In the first place there is no evidence that automation will do more than increase somewhat the past small annual increase of powers of production—a point that will be dealt with further. But even if automation did vastly increase the efficiency of production that would not give any guarantee that the workers would benefit, for the products do not belong to the workers who produce them, but to the Capitalists who own the plant and factories.

What if anything the workers get out of increased production depends on their ability to back up their demands with effective struggle. Employers will not in the future, any more than in the past, give higher wages merely because output and profits are rising.

In this country the bait is held out that automation will enable the manufacturers to produce more cheaply and sell more cheaply and thus gain new or widened markets for British goods. But every other country is developing the new methods too, and in each country the workers are being told the same story. Cheaper British cars will meet in the world market the competition of



"We have now," gentlemen, got a robot which eats, wears clothes and watches T.V., so that it can consume the goods we produce when all the displaced workers are on the dole."

cheaper cars from U.S.A., Germany, France, Russia, and all the other producers, so automation if it led to all-round cheapening would solve no problem and alter nothing. In actual fact it is by no means certain that it will lead to cheaper cars but cheapness is not all. Another of its purposes is to enlarge the output and quicken production—which is not necessarily the same thing as to cheapen it. But it is of vital importance to manufacturers to get their new models on the market with minimum delay and thus get the cream of the market ahead of competitors. A contributor to the *Financial Times* (10/5/56) describing the £4,000,000 new tractor plant of Standard Motors says, "it does not follow that the new tractor will be relatively cheaper," for against some expected saving of labour in the works has to be set the great cost of the new plant.

In the motor industry, battles for supremacy and survival are being fought inside America and Britain, and internationally with other competitors. Automation is a weapon in the struggle, but the struggle is a typical feature of the way Capitalism operated long before this latest of

the technical developments. It should not be forgotten that the tens of thousands of unsold cars that led to workers being put on short time in Britain, and the 900,000 unsold cars that have had similar consequences in U.S.A. were not to any extent the consequence of automation: they were the normal results of over-production in face of a falling demand.

On the experience America has already had with automation an article in the *Economist* (5 May, 1956) has some interesting things to say. In chemicals automation has led to real economies of production and "here automation pays already; and pays well." The same is true of the steel industry, "but in most cases, particularly in the automobile and electrical industries, automation means that machines have become bigger and more expensive and that there are more of them."

The article goes on:—

"In the newer production industries, automation has come to stay and probably to predominate. This is not at all the same thing as saying that automation has begun to pay. When the giant machines and automatic transfer

devices arrive in one plant, its competitors feel compelled to get them as well to secure the same increases in the pace and capacity of their output. But the suspicion is growing in Detroit and Pittsburgh and Cleveland that, in spite of its speed, automation is very expensive."

"Automation does reduce direct labour costs but not always proportionately, since the remaining operators have to be more highly-skilled. In addition, most firms are finding that the 'automated' lines require large numbers of maintenance men, who must be first-class technicians."

The writer in the *Economist* adds one wry comment about the attitude of the trade unions:—

"If any net saving in labour costs remains, the trade unions have made it clear that they expect this gain to be paid out as higher wages to the remaining workers. In some cases, therefore, the savings anticipated when the machinery was ordered may prove illusory."

We can say that that trade union attitude is more sensible than passively accepting whatever the employers want to dictate but it is not at all sensible in relation to the real need of our age, that of getting rid of this cut-throat, wasteful and war-producing system of society so that greater powers of production will harm no-one and will benefit all.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," June, 1906)

The Plight of the Teachers

The National Union of Teachers has been in existence for 35 years. It has three representatives in Parliament, a membership rivalling in numbers the great Trade Unions, each member a "captain and guide of the democracy." An Archbishop sends greetings to its latest Conference. Vicar and Major, Ex-Cabinet Minister and M.P., all unite to "welcome" and patronise the delegates assembled at said Conference. All are greeted with rapturous "applause," and all is as well as well can be in this best of all possible educational worlds.

And yet—and yet—the career of a "captain," the lot of a "guide," is still like unto the policeman's life "when constabulary duty's to be done." List to the plaint of the President:—

"A career inadequately remunerated, passed under harassing conditions, practically, in many cases, the servants of officials who rule with an iron hand, depending for their livelihood on voice and brain, and, if these fail, cast aside without remorse."

He is a little higher than the artisan, and a little lower than the bank clerk. In any case he is absolutely dependent upon wages for his subsistence. He is, in short, a proletarian. Does he ever seriously consider that, for class purposes, he is ever busily employed in manufacturing better material for the merchant and sweeter, sturdier stuff, mayhap for "cannon fodder," obedient tools to shoot their own kith and kin if necessary.

If 35 years of Unionism has effected so little for you, might it not be worth while to seriously review the position, and, dominated by a set definiteness of purpose, recognising your position as but units—useful units—in the great Capitalist game of Grab, infuse a more dignified, less cap-in-hand attitude into your Union? The declared reason for the existence of the N.U.T. is the furtherance of the interests of the child. Is there not a danger that it may become the happy hunting-ground of the eloquent Party-man in a hurry to round his own life into a success?

THE CRITICS CRITICISED

Professor Popper Looks at History

MANY critics see Marxism as a theory of iron determinism which regards men as puppets pulled by the strings of historical necessity. Mr. R. K. Popper in "The Open Society and its Enemies," believes that too. One could say why bother about such palpable errors? The pity of it is, that Mr. Popper has written it but many who read him might come to believe it.

Mr. Popper holds that Marxist historicism is fatalism. He also holds that it helps to generate beliefs that men are mere instruments of impersonal forces. Such views, he thinks, tend towards men coming to accept a collective tyranny called by him, "the closed society" as against the "open society" where democracy and toleration prevail.

Mr. Popper is a christian toreador who seizes the

Marxist bull by the historic horns by declaring there can be no concrete history of mankind. "Such a concrete history would have to be the history of all men; of all human hope, struggle and suffering" (p. 270). We are also told "it would have to be the life of the unknown individual man . . . this is the real content of human experience down the ages" (p. 272). Thus does Mr. Popper consign history to the unknown and unknowable. There are, he tells us, separate histories, viz., the histories of politics, technocracy, art, economics, poetry, etc. Such histories, he thinks, should be studied and interpreted from our own standpoint. We can, for example, interpret the history of political power in the light of "our struggle for the open society." While history vide Mr. Popper "has no meaning, in this way we can give meaning

to it."

Just as one did not know where to have Dame Quickly, one does not know where to have Mr. Popper. Thus we are told (page 268) "The merits of interpretation must rest on its ability to elucidate historical facts." Yet he informs us (p. 265), that "the facts of history have been collected in accordance with a preconceived point of view." In that case they are not historical facts but highly dubious material incapable of providing any valid knowledge of historic causation. Indeed, Mr. Popper contends historical reasoning is circular, because, starting as it does from preconceived theories it can only in turn deduce preconceived theories.

But if, according to Mr. Popper, concrete history does not exist, then only what he terms the various histories can provide historical sources. But these sources he assures us are tainted sources. Any interpretation based on them must be suspect—including the interpretations of Mr. Popper.

Yet we are told (p. 266) that some interpretations have more merit than others. That is some are at any rate more in accordance with the accepted records. But if these records do not constitute genuine knowledge one wonders what real significance can be attached to the word "merit." Curiously enough in the same paragraph we are told "that if only one authority which gives information on certain events that fit in with his own specific interpretation, can be radically interpreted in a different way, then this deviation may take on something of the semblance of a scientific hypothesis." On the one hand we are told that the merit of an historical interpretation lies in its accord with the records and on the other hand an interpretation can only achieve some semblance to a scientific hypothesis by radically departing from it. But Mr. Popper's statement that an historical interpretation can achieve some semblance to a scientific hypothesis is inconsistent with his contention that there can be no factual evidence and hence no valid historical knowledge. For it is obvious that unless such knowledge is available an hypothesis having any semblance of being scientific, becomes impossible.

Mr. Popper also tells us that although there is no such thing as universal history there are, nevertheless, universal laws of the separate histories. They are, he says, trivial and provide no selective and unifying principle. He gives as an example of what he means by a universal law of history by telling us that if two equally well armed and well led forces meet, then the one with a tremendous superiority in man power will win. This merely tells us that a good big 'un will always beat a good

little 'un. While this may have some relevance in pugilistic circles what relevance it has to the character and content of history and the nature of historical investigation only Mr. Popper knows, but alas he refuses to tell us.

Mr. Popper repeats the stock objection to history by making invidious comparisons between it and what he calls the generalising sciences (such as physics, biology, sociology, etc.) This objection, however, tells most heavily against Mr. Popper, because if physics is taken as a model, invidious comparisons can be drawn between it and large parts of biology. While if we compare physics with the *ad hoc* assumptions and vast amount of unrelated detail which goes to make up the alleged science of sociology, then the comparison between physics and sociology becomes positively odious. While an evaluation of psychology on such terms would forever exclude it from any pretensions to be called scientific. Indeed, on the logic of Mr. Popper's "comparison," many subjects regarded as scientific would have to yield their claims in this respect.

It is true that historical investigation in common with many other fields of scientific knowledge cannot employ "the controlled experiment" of physics. It is not true to say that it cannot acquire valid knowledge. To paraphrase Marx, "In physics and chemistry the microscope and the reagent are used, in historical investigation the force of abstraction must replace both." The force of abstraction is itself an integral part of scientific procedure. So far then as the possibility of obtaining valid knowledge is concerned it holds good for all fields of systematic inquiry. Thus history differs from physics in the same way that biology or geology differ from physics that is in subject matter and not because physics has a logic and procedure of a different order.

That there is no intrinsic barrier in the nature of things to prevent their scientific investigation is hardly questionable. If, of course, history was able to apply the same procedures and tests as physics then it would not be history. Mr. Popper apparently is not prepared because history is not physics to grant it any scientific validity.

Marxism does not hold that there is some impersonal prime mover called historic inevitability. It simply asserts that the complex phenomena we term history are capable of being coherently organised in a manner which gives knowledge and understanding to the affairs of men and the ability to predict within limits the broad trend of human development.

E.W.

(To be continued)

CORRESPONDENCE

We have received the following letter from the Buddha Study Association:—

Dear Sir,

Re "Buddha Puts the Clock Back."

I hope that you will, in fairness, publish this letter of protest against the article "Buddha Puts the Clock Back," by Mr. Offord, and published in your September, 1955, issue, in which the writer attempts to show that Buddhists are little more than social parasites.

Mr. Offord commences by offering some "facts" regarding the Buddha and Buddhism, many of which are

erroneous; he then picks on the most theoretical aspect of the principle of rebirth, which he confuses with reincarnation—namely, from the human state to that of an animal or insect. From this he goes on to convince himself that Buddhists are so obsessed with the notion of being "reincarnated in another creature" that they lack all social ambition or initiative during their present lifetime in this world as normal human beings.

One has only to visit Buddhist countries to discover that this state of affairs simply does not exist among practising Buddhists.

Mr. Offord strikes a false note in his opening paragraph, when he describes the little statue that "sits cross-legged displaying a broad belly with a prominent navel" being the "statue of Buddha." These so-called "Smiling Buddhas" do not represent the historical Buddha Gotama, from whose austere philosophy was evolved the popular religion Buddhism. It is obvious that Mr. Offord is ignorant of the finer aspects of both the original philosophy and of the religion for him to refer to the personage "Buddha" without the definite article; a few examples of this ignorance are his references to "an idol of worship" (the Buddha is not worshipped!); the Buddha "was so surfeited with the idle luxury of palace life that at the age of 30 he set forth alone . . ." (even this story which is only a legend, is misquoted: the Buddha-to-be, or *bodhisattva*, left at 29); that "all men are part of the universe" (a Hinduistic conception introduced long after the Buddha, into Mahayana Buddhism of the Northern School); "in some countries, such as Thailand, it is customary for all men to become Buddhist monks at some time in their lives, though with an eye to realism this is confined to three months" (why omit Burma, Laos, Cambodia?; this period is not confined to three months; it may be anything from two or three days to two or three years, depending upon the individual's inclinations; neither does this time period hinge upon the question of "abstinence from sex," as Mr. Offord states).

We then come to the question of Rebirth upon which Mr. Offord builds a chain of argument which becomes fantastic. In Buddhist philosophy, rebirth means the continuity of a *process* of impersonal evolution in terms of simple cause and effect divorced from permanent elements of time and space. This is to say that this *process* persists irrespective of death. Mr. Offord would like us to think that a man or woman who is reborn in Britain, because he or she believes in this principle of rebirth, cannot fulfill the social obligations of a British citizen. I leave it to the reader to make up his or her own mind on this question!

What has made Mr. Offord biased against Buddhism? and against rebirth in particular? Let me quote the Buddha Himself (*Paramatthaka Sutta—Sn iv., 5-verse 3*): "Experts are agreed that that man who labels things 'bad' is thereby making it impossible for himself to see them as they really are."

Yours truly,

G. F. ALLEN,

Hon. Secretary.

Re "Buddha Puts the Clock Back."

Answer to Letter Received.

There are two main sects of the Buddhist faith. The first is Hinayana (Little Vehicle) whose adherents consider Buddha to be not a deity, but as a most eminent man who merely points the way to Nirvana, and incidentally consider him as the only Buddha. Westerners who become Buddhists usually belong to this group. The Mahayana, or majority, deity Buddha and the various *Buddhisatvas* (Buddhist Saints). In *China*, page 280, Fitzgerald states that the Chinese Buddhists worship Buddha. In *Buddhism—Studies in Comparative Religion* Poussin also states (page 26) that Buddha is worshipped. In actual practice many Buddhists of the *Hinayana* sect also worship Buddha. A. H. Brodrick, an experienced traveller in S.E. Asia, in "Little Vehicle"

(page 257) says "The Little Vehicle, as it exists today in Cambodia, Siam, Burma and Ceylon, is, for the people a worship of the Buddha, and for the more educated monks, a theology with a fragile philosophic basis." Of course the development of Capitalism and the extension of modern education in these countries is steadily making inroads into the belief there in the supernatural in the West.

As to whether Buddha was 29 or 30 when he set forth . . . we regard this as a quibble.

Why were Burma, Laos and Cambodia omitted? We presumed that the phrase "some countries such as Thailand" could cover the neighbouring Buddhist countries which our Correspondent seems so anxious to list separately.

The period of three months was mentioned but it was considered unnecessary in that short article to add that of course the exact period varied with different individuals. The article did not say that this period hinged upon the question of abstinence from sex. The actual words used were "to abstain from sex and the other pleasures of life."

We have experienced a little difficulty in understanding our Correspondent's explanation of "Rebirth," but we certainly do not wish anyone to infer that we consider that a Buddhist cannot fulfil the social obligations expected of them by the ruling class. In fact the article says the contrary. "Even the pacific side of Buddhism, which one might think could be a drawback in an acquisitive society where wealth, markets and trade routes have to be defended by the workers for their masters with force of arms can be overcome. Japanese Capitalism has obviously found the answer to this." Our Correspondent indignantly leaves it to the reader to believe that a British Buddhist "will fulfil the social obligations of a British citizen." We have no doubts about it.

The letter quotes from Buddha himself implying that our article labelled Buddhism as "bad." We deny this for the reason that the article did not just label Buddhism as "bad" but tried to explain its effect on the mind and thus on men's actions including its beneficial effect on art. Our case was that Buddhism, like other religions, is an opiate for the workers and it is because of this that we appear to Mr. Allen to be biased.

F. OFFORD.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning.

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

May Day in London was successful and the keenness of members was very heartening. Several came from Wickford and sold STANDARDS outside Hyde Park, whilst others sold literature along the route of the Trades Council procession and then remained selling in Trafalgar Square. Literature was well displayed by the many comrades outside Hyde Park and sales were quite good. A well decorated trolley was the main platform in the Park where a constant audience listened to several speakers and put good questions to the platform. At the same time another good meeting was held at our usual platform. Handbills for the evening meeting in Conway Hall were distributed. This meeting was well attended and a good collection and further literature sales added to the successful outdoor efforts of the afternoon.

Camberwell and South-West London members held a successful meeting on Clapham Common from 3 p.m. till 6 p.m. A good audience and literature sales are reported. Members hope to continue regular meetings on Clapham Common on Sunday afternoons throughout the summer.

May Day Week-end in Nottingham. The Branch held its first meeting on the Saturday evening—mainly to advertise the meetings on Sunday. The meeting commenced at 7 p.m. and continued until 9.45. The audience fluctuated between 150 and 250.

On Sunday morning the Labour Party and Trades Council procession assembled in Old Market Square just before 11 a.m. Before the procession left for the Forest, our members sold SOCIALIST STANDARDS. Following the Labour procession were a motley group of "Communists," between five and 50 years of age, and led by a very ancient car, containing a gramophone, playing a much worn record of the "Red Flag."

At 3 p.m. we commenced our May Day meetings proper—against some noisy opposition from a group of "Faith Healers"—complete with piano accordion and tamborine! Our speakers dealt with the origin of the May Day festivities and their later adoption by the working-class organisations and with the activities of two of the allegedly working-class parties in this country—the Communist Party and the Labour Party. As the meeting progressed our alternative to the present system of society was fully developed. The audience was between 200 and 300. The meeting terminated at 5.30 p.m. and recommenced soon after six o'clock when the meeting was forced to close (mainly due to the noise caused by a Salvation Army band). The audience throughout this meeting was nearly 500 and literature sales were very good.

Glasgow and Kelvingrove Branches have just concluded their most promising indoor propaganda season since the war. Indoor propaganda is difficult to sustain and indeed, we are the only Party that even attempts to run weekly meetings in Glasgow. But this year consistency and perseverance were rewarded, attendances, literature sales and collections were good, especially in March and April. Members are now looking forward to the



summer outdoor propaganda season with lighter hearts and more determination in the ranks than has been evident for some time.

Hopes were high for a successful May Day, but the weather decreed otherwise. Comrade May held an audience of more than 100 for over an hour in the pelting rain at Queen's Park before being forced to give up. Despite the weather our evening meeting at St. Andrews Hall was a good one. Although the audience was only about 90, questions were good and discussion lively. Over £2 worth of literature was sold and the collection was £4. Weather permitting, meetings will be held every Sunday at 8 p.m. on West Regent Street. Glasgow Comrades are asked to support these meetings and continue the good work that has been started during the winter months.

Ealing Branch. The special drive to sell the SOCIALIST STANDARD has got off to an excellent start. At the time of going to press (16th May) the Branch's previous record monthly total (53 dozen) has already been exceeded. The Branch has ordered 80 dozen STANDARDS altogether and is optimistic that they will sell them. The response to our canvassers has been very favourable and an average of 40-50 copies have been sold on each canvass.

Members are reminded that the Branch's annual outing is on 10th June. This time we shall be going to Littlehampton. There are now only a few seats left on the coach and members wishing to take the trip are asked to let the Secretary know as soon as possible.

The Secretary of Ealing Branch has recently been in contact with Comrade Vic Heeley, of Manchester Branch, who, many members may recall, was responsible for the stupendously high sales of our pamphlet "Principles and Policy" in his home area a few years ago. Mainly by canvassing, he succeeded in getting our literature into countless working-class homes, but was forced to give up for a time due to personal and domestic circumstances.

He has lately recommenced this work and promises to make a really big assault during May. If all goes well, he should sell a large number of SOCIALIST STANDARDS and other literature throughout the month, and he assures us that this is only the beginning.

But his work does not end there. He has been a constant and searching critic of Labour and Tory policies

in the correspondence columns of the local Manchester Press had had a series of letters published—much to the annoyance of some of his opponents.

These "lone wolf" activities are invaluable to Comrades living in areas where no local branches exist, and can give them the satisfaction of helping forward the

Socialist cause in a practical manner. Here then is a suggested way in which isolated members can quite easily extend their efforts for the Party. The appropriate committee at Head Office will be pleased to give assistance and advice.

P.H.

THE MOSLEY MOVEMENT TODAY

BRITISH FASCISM'S NEW LOOK

"Fascism stands for the building of the highest civilization the world has ever seen . . ."
(Sir Oswald Mosley, Olympia, June 7th, 1934)

1932 saw the birth of the "British Union of Fascists," with their black shirts and uniforms, armoured cars, their provocative marches through the East End of London, and their Mass rallies. To-day, over 20 years later, the movement is still with us. They still hold out-door meetings, and recently Sir Oswald Mosley held a number of indoor meetings in Birmingham, Kensington, Brixton, and elsewhere. True, it does not have the membership it had in the 'thirties. No longer are members allowed to wear uniforms.

Since the war, when over 800 of its members spent a number of years in prison, the movement has been re-organised—and renamed. The B.U.F. is now "Union Movement." The word "Fascism" has—for the time being—been dropped; no doubt because of its unpopularity. But the British Fascists continue to call themselves "Blackshirt." At the London County Council Elections—1955, their candidates in Shoreditch and Finsbury urged electors to "Vote Blackshirt." And "Wake 'Em Up at County Hall."

"Union Movement" retains its pre-war "Flash" sign on its literature, banners, flags and badges.

To-day we no longer see "Britain for the British," or "Britain First," chalked or whitewashed on walls; although such slogans as "Slump or Mosley," or the letters "K. B. W." (Keep Britain White) can sometimes be seen in Kensington, Hackney, Brixton, and elsewhere.

"National Socialism," the phrase under which the German Nazis operated, has given way to Mosley's latest: "European Socialism"—yet another contradiction! British Fascism wears a New Look!

At a mass meeting held last year in Trafalgar Square, Sir Oswald Mosley outlined his policy for Britain and Europe. He said that Union Movement "stood for peace"—just like the Communist do, no doubt!—but that they were not Pacifists; "because they would always fight, if the life of the country was threatened." ("Union," 6th August, 1955). Mosley would have been a little nearer the truth had he said that Union Movement might—not would—support a war if it considered that British property interests were threatened.

The British Fascists have never "stood for peace"; they only opposed Britain's participation in the last war because it was against Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. Unlike Socialists, the Fascists are not opposed to war on principle; they do not oppose war because it is against the interests of working people in all countries to fight for their rulers' interests. The Fascist attitude is similar to that of the Communists: some wars are "good" wars, some are "bad"; some just, some unjust; some should be supported; others opposed.

Mosley and his British Union of Fascists did not oppose or condemn Mussolini when he attacked Abyssinia, or General Franco and his fellow generals and Falangists, when they revolted against the Republican Government in Spain in 1936; or when Hitler attacked Poland in 1939.

As an alternative to the present system of society, with its antagonisms, its violence, its racial and religious hatreds and intolerance, neither Sir Oswald nor his movement have an answer.

Unlike Socialists they do not stand for an entirely new society, embracing all people, where poverty, privilege and intolerance will be things of the past. Mosley's policy is one of Nations, national interests—"Europe a Nation." The main theme that Sir Oswald Mosley put forward at the Trafalgar Square meeting was: " . . . Europe a Nation . . . the European people should unite into one nation and use 'European Socialism' to increase their standard of life so that three hundred millions of Europe could consume what they produced. With the raw materials of White Africa and of South America they could be independent of world supplies and world markets."

It is obvious from the above quoted remarks that neither Mosley nor his Union Movement has the slightest idea how world-capitalism operates. The ramifications of our society are obviously a complete mystery to them. Neither Britain nor the rest of Europe could ever be "independent" of world supplies or world markets within capitalism. And if he thinks that by adopting his spurious "European Socialism," i.e., Fascism, the peoples (workers) of Europe would consume what they produced and what they desired, then Mosley is even more foolish than the other Capitalist politicians and would-be leaders—which perhaps explains why he has been out in the political wilderness for over 20 years.

The Mosley movement of to-day is in essence no different from the pre-war B.U.F. Their papers, *Union Incorporating Action*, *The East London Blackshirt*, *The European*, *The East Anglian Press*, etc., are much the same as pre-war Fascist publications.

To the Fascists the "Old Gang" politicians and Parties, the Jews, the "aliens," the "coloured invasion," and the financiers and Bankers—the "alien" ones, of course!—are the root cause of all our troubles. Their "solution" is the same old reform programme: the same old appeal to emotion and prejudice; plus a new one that they borrowed from the Anarchists—Syndicalism. Of the coloured workers from Jamaica and the West Indies who come here to get something of a living, they say: "We will send them back home, and we are the only candidates pledged to do it." (Union

Movement election manifesto in Shoreditch and Finsbury, 1955). Such is the cynical programme of our local Fascists!

The whole of Union Movement policy is based on the acceptance of leadership. The workers need leaders to solve their problems for them, they say. If only they trusted THE "Leader," Sir Oswald Mosley, things would be much different!

Mosley has the solution to everything—slumps, the "coloured invasion" the "housing problem," "Communism"—even the bad roads! (See *Union*, 10:8:55).

STALIN IN ECLIPSE

THEY CAME NOT TO PRAISE HIM BUT TO BURY HIM

On March 5th, 1953, one Joseph Vissarionovich Djughashvili, alias Stalin, died.

In the *Soviet Weekly* (12:3:53), under a large photograph of the late Russian dictator, the following words were written:—

"The immortal name of STALIN will always live in the hearts of the Soviet people and all progressive mankind!"

And in a statement published on the same day as Stalin's death, by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, we are told that: "The heart of Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, comrade in arms and continuer of genius of the cause of Lenin, wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and the Soviet people, no longer beats." The Russian Communists, in their statement, also inform us that: "Comrade Stalin led our country to victory over Fascism during the second World War. . . ."

In his funeral oration Georgi M. Malenkov, now Soviet Minister of Power Stations, spoke of Stalin—the "Great" Stalin—as the greatest genius of mankind, the great thinker of our epoch and the greatest theoretician on national questions. And he continued:—

"The strengthening of the country's defence capacities and the consolidation of the Soviet armed forces have been the object of Comrade Stalin's tireless concern."

Malenkov then bid farewell to "our teacher and leader, our beloved friend . . . !"

After Malenkov had finished Beria, who has since been shot as a traitor and an enemy of the Soviet State, reminded those present that:—

"Our great leaders Lenin and Stalin taught us untiringly to increase and sharpen the vigilance of the Party and the people, against the designs and intrigues of the enemies of the Soviet State. We must now still further intensify our vigilance."

And they did—against the Secret Police Chief, Beria, himself!

Three Years Later

Three years after the death of the "great" Stalin, "Comrade" Krushev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in his report to the twentieth Congress of the Party, shocked many of the "comrades" present by saying:—

"Many of the shortcomings we are now working to eliminate would never have arisen if not for the complacency that at one time gained currency in some links of the Party, and for the tendency to give a rosy picture of the real state of affairs. . . ."

"If Party unity was to be further consolidated and Party organisations made more active, it is necessary to re-establish the Party standards worked out by Lenin, which in the past had frequently been violated."

Unfortunately, the Fascists, with their slavish doctrine of leadership, like their less dictatorial brethren in other Parties that attempt to reform the present system, do not understand that these and many other problems that confront people, not only in Britain or Europe, but all over the world, are inherent in the system itself. The problems are themselves part of the society we live in.

Neither Mosley nor his movement, with their erroneous race theories and dictatorial policies, warrant any support from the workers of this country.

"PEN."

"It was of paramount importance to re-establish and to strengthen in every way the Leninist principle of collective leadership. . . ."

"The Central Committee was concerned to develop the creative activity of Party members. . . . It vigorously condemned the cult of the individual as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, a cult which tends to make a particular leader a hero and miracle worker and at the same time belittles the role of the Party and the masses and tends to reduce their creative effort. . . . Currency of the cult of the individual tended to minimize the role of collective leadership in the Party, and at all times resulted in serious drawbacks in our work." (Cominform Journal, 17.2.56).

This was only the first shot against the late "leader and genius" of the Soviet Union—Joseph Stalin.

M. A. Suslov also condemned the cult of the individual; and said that collective leadership had at last been re-established. And A. I. Mikoyan admitted that in the past three years "after a long interruption, collective leadership has been created." (Applause). (Cominform Journal, 2:3:56, emphasis theirs). He continued by saying: " . . . for approximately 20 years we had no collective leadership. . . ."

"In analyzing the economic position of present-day capitalism it is doubtful whether Stalin's well-known thesis in the 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.' can be of any help to us or is correct—in relation to the United States, Britain and France—the thesis that, with the break-up of the world market the volume of production in these countries will shrink! This assertion does not explain the complex and contradictory phenomena of present-day capitalism and the fact of the growth of capitalist production in many countries after the war." (Cominform Journal, 2.3.56).

Dealing with Stalin's book "The Short history of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Soviet Union," Mikoyan says that it is inadequate and inaccurate. After attacking other books on Party History and the Civil War, he admits that "Such historical scribbles have nothing whatever in common with Marxist history."

Stalin the Terrorist

Since the termination of the twentieth Communist Party Congress in Moscow, it has been reported that Krushev made another—more pointed—attack on Stalin, at a secret session. He is reported to have accused Stalin of making mistakes in regard to Soviet agriculture, of weakening the Russian Army prior to the Second World War by killing 5,000 Russian army officers—and of terrorism. Even Harry Pollitt, the British Communist, admits that "Stalin . . . ignored warnings about Hitler's invasion plans. . . ." (Daily Worker, 24:3:56). He also admits in his first article condemning Stalin, that Stalin made serious mistakes in connection with agricul-

tural policy, and later in his relations with Yugoslavia.

According to the *Manchester Guardian* (28:3:56), the first reliable report of what Mr. Krushev actually said about Stalin appeared in the Polish Communist Party paper *Trybuna Ludu*. In an article by Jerzy Morawski, a leading Polish Communist, he says:—

" . . . the degeneration of the security organs could, and indeed did take place. They became independent of the Party authorities and were used to consolidate the personal power of Stalin."

And:—

"Later on repression was used automatically and blindly."

And further:—

"As a result many honest people were sent to prison penal camps or shot."

"Almost all the leaders and active members of the Polish Communist Party then in the Soviet Union were arrested and sent to camps."

For many years both Socialist and non-Socialist critics of the Russian régime have said that Russia was in fact a dictatorship, that Stalin was a ruthless dictator, that the Soviet Union was a police State, that many innocent people had been thrown into slave camps, and that neither democracy nor Socialism existed there. And for as many years Communists, in all countries, have denied these allegations. Yet now, scarcely three years after Stalin's death, the Communists themselves are admitting much, if not all, of the truth about Stalin and his bloody dictatorship.

Perhaps in time more will be admitted. The Communists may even deny that Socialism exists in Russia.

PETER E. NEWELL.

FULHAM BRANCH—LECTURE AND DISCUSSIONS

at
34, ST. GEORGE'S SQUARE, S.W.1

on

THURSDAY EVENING at 8 p.m.

June 7th Title to be announced—C. WILSON.

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park . . . 3 p.m. and 4.30 p.m.

East Street
(Walworth) . . . June 3rd 11 a.m.

" 10th 12.30 p.m.

" 17th 11 a.m.

" 24th 12.30 p.m.

Whitstone Pond
(Hampstead) . . . 11.30 a.m.

Finsbury Park . . . 11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station . . . 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate . . . 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station . . . 8 p.m.

Station Road, Ilford . . . 8 p.m.

SATURDAYS

Jolly Butchers Hill . . . 7.30 p.m.

(Nr. Wood Green Stn.)

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.

Tower Hill . . . Thursdays at 1 p.m.

SELF DECEPTION

Of late years modern psychology, with its Freudian basis, has had considerable appeal for the shallow intellectual. It is so elevating, and causes so little cultural embarrassment, to stand before the mental mirror contemplating one's brain and imagining what one thinks it thinks it is thinking. Needless to say the reality is far from the loftiness of the conception. But it is a very self-satisfying game; puffs one's conceit without the toil of acquiring real useful knowledge, and, like the card-sharper's ability, acquires some financial gain and social standing from, what Barnum referred to as, "the mug that is born every day."

GILMAC.

PRINCIPLES—AND PRACTICE

"It is a matter of historical experience that nothing that is wrong in principle can be right in practice."

People are apt to delude themselves on that point, but the ultimate result will always prove the truth of the maxim. A violation of equal rights can never serve to maintain institutions which are founded on equal rights." Carl Schurz, United States Secretary, 1878. Quoted by Howard Fast in the "Last Frontier."

ADDRESSES OF COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA, P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Australia.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, P.O. Box 115, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND, P. Boylan, 115, Walkinstown Drive, Dublin, Eire.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND, P.O. Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, 11, Faneuil Hall Square, Boston, 9. Mass, U.S.A.

The SOCIALIST STANDARD, WESTERN SOCIALIST and other Socialist literature can be obtained from the above.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day	1/- (Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War	1/- (" " 1/2)
Russia Since 1917	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years	1/- (" " 1/2)
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis	1/- (" " 1/2)
Socialism	4d. (" " 6d.)
Socialism or Federal Union?	4d. (" " 6d.)
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy	4d. (" " 6d.)
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?	4d. (" " 6d.)
Nationalisation or Socialism?	6d. (" " 8d.)

All obtainable from the Literature Committee, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bannie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 6th and 20th June, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

ISLINGTON BRANCH LECTURE

on
THURSDAY, 21st JUNE at 8 p.m.

at
CO-OP HALL, 129, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7

"Ancient America"—R. AMBRIDGE

Questions and Discussion.

All welcome.

IMPORTANT TO ALL LONDON MEMBERS
MID-DAY MEETINGS

We can resume the meetings at Lincoln's Inn Fields provided that those members who are free can keep the pitch free from parking cars. The period a Comrade should attend is 10.15 a.m. till 12 noon. A number of speakers are prepared to speak provided they can be sure of the speaking pitch.

This station is well worth maintaining, so members PLEASE HELP ASSIST THE PARTY in continuing to maintain this excellent propaganda station.

Propaganda Committee.

GROUPS

Will anybody interested in forming a Group or desiring any other information about Groups, apply to Group Secretary, at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months (6 months, 2/9) for which 5/6 is enclosed.

Name

(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (7th and 21st June).

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reeve Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 4th and 18th June, at 8 p.m. at 76, Duabarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.5.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (6th and 20th June) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6493). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 5th and 19th June, George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3527.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Griley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR
"SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form opposite.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- ★ Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- Submit names for sample copies.
- ★ Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- ★ Get libraries to display the S.S.
- ★ Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 623 Vol. 52 July, 1956

Scandinavian Fairy Tales

THE WORKER'S PARADISE

WHO WILL SWITCH ON
THE LIGHT FOR THE
ELECTRICIANS?

CAPITALISM 1956

PSYCHOLOGY AND
SOCIALISM

U-MANIA

FILMS

THE SILLINESS OF
BERNARD SHAW

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

^D
4

IN ANY COUNTRY where a Labour Party is out of power it is natural that its propaganda should include glowing accounts of the success a Labour Government is supposed to be having somewhere else. Between the wars when the Tories governed here, Labour Party and I.L.P. supporters were inspired by pamphlets describing the alleged glories of Labour rule in Australia, Austria, Germany, France or Spain and whenever the British Labour Party has been in office similar propaganda went on in overseas countries where the local equivalent of the Labour Party was the opposition. Since the 1951 election, when Attlee was defeated, the centre of interest for Labour Party supporters has shifted to Denmark and Sweden. We have been told what a magnificent "Welfare State" they have, how the extremes of riches and poverty have been abolished, and how well they manage relationships between employers and workers. For a long time Denmark and Sweden were running pretty close for favour in British Labour circles, but with Denmark undoubtedly a short way ahead.

Something Rotten in the State of Denmark

Then suddenly the lead passed to Sweden and not at all because of the visit to that country of the British Royal Family. The reason was that happy, Labour-governed, Welfare State Denmark suddenly erupted and threw its admirers into consternation. Here is a brief account from the Scandinavian correspondent of the *Economist* (28 April, 1956):—

"The series of strikes, which for four weeks threatened to paralyse the country's economy, were only checked when the Folketing (Parliament), after a stormy all-night session, passed an act giving the official mediator's proposals the force of law. These proposals, which satisfied only a small part of the workers' original demands, had been accepted by 74 per cent. of the Employers' Federation but rejected, albeit by a narrow majority, by the Federation of Trade Unions. Had these positions been reversed the Social Democrat government would have felt itself on firmer ground. Its reluctant intervention was greeted by a 24-hour general strike, and a countrywide wave of protest demonstrations. In Copenhagen a crowd of 100,000 strong demonstrated before the Parliament, brought traffic to a standstill, and called for the Prime Minister's resignation. Demonstrations in Odense stopped buses and overturned cars. At Aalborg, a policeman died after being struck by a missile. Rioting dockers at Esbjerg attempted to throw the cargo of a British merchant ship into the harbour. In the large centres throughout Denmark the police made numerous arrests."

There is much more in the *Economist's* account about the troubles in the Danish paradise and although for the moment the workers have been forced by the drastic action of the Labour Government to return to work with a 3 per cent. wage increase instead of the 20 per cent. they claimed, the *Economist* says:—

"there is a deep malaise beneath the surface which may well lead to fresh outbreaks," and among the workers "there is a widespread feeling that the Social Democrat government has betrayed its own supporters."

This is dismaying to the British Labour Party because the Danish Social Democrats have a policy identical with their own. But the real betrayal in Denmark, as among Labour supporters everywhere, is that they be-



trayed themselves in ever supposing that the Labour policy of trying to make capitalism work beneficially can be a success.

In Sweden, too

Now Sweden has the limelight and Mr. Paul Andersen, formerly Paris correspondent of the *Observer*, in a broadcast reproduced in the *Listener* (31 May, 1956), describes that country as "the Egalitarian Paradise," "the world's most perfect Welfare State." Of course his picture of Sweden as a land of equality is far from true and indeed his own account gives a little evidence of its in-

accuracy. For example he tells both of "a modest-priced if most luxuriously decorated, communal canteen, but also a Vaellingby branch of one of Stockholm's most expensive restaurants." And while the rich can eat "for about £3 a head, lobster thermidor, washed down with Chamberlin '47. In the self-service canteen you will also sit in near luxury comfort behind glass walls and find three hot dishes at about 2s. each. . . ." In short, Sweden, like every other country whatever the party label of its government caters for the rich and for the poor. Indeed Mr. Andersen does not really mean equality of wealth distribution but "greatest possible equality of its distribution." We know how great a difference that can mean for we have so often heard Britain described in similar terms.

There were things about Sweden that Mr. Andersen did not say. He did not mention unemployment of 4.3% at the end of 1955, about four times the percentage in this country, or the 158,000 who received Public Poor Relief during 1953 (latest figures available). And his broadcast ended on a curious note. He says he asked "an old and famous Swedish Socialist" if everybody is happy "in this gilded germ-free egalitarian paradise." The gentleman in question (who, from other quoted remarks, is no more a Socialist than any other of the muddled-headed believers in Labour-governed capitalism) "told me firmly, 'No,' and added, 'of course I shouldn't tell you, but it's the truth. Life seems to have become empty and void of purpose.'"

He went on to explain that because life in Sweden now lacks tension "people replace the normal fears and tensions of the normal battle of life by artificial fears and by personal tensions—by neurosis."

The broadcaster capped this with the following:—
" . . . the most surprising fact, perhaps, of the most advanced Welfare State in being, is that last year's figures of suicides exceeded the annual toll of fatal road casualties." Mr. Andersen and his Swedish friend who believe that people commit suicide because they have no tensions and fears to make them unhappy can hardly be congratulated on their insight. It might help them to correct their judgment if they looked across the frontier into Denmark and recalled that the same kind of nonsense about industrial and social harmony was related of that country—until the sudden explosion of industrial strife proved how wrong it was. And it is a curious oversight that no mention was made in the broadcast of the fierce and costly struggle to build up the Swedish paradise into a militarily powerful state competent to be an effective factor in another war. Only a very superficial observer of the modern world of war-ready Powers could suppose it possible that the people of Sweden (or of any other country) are really free from the universal dread of possible atomic annihilation. H.

CAPITALISM 1956

THE political parties which seek election on a programme of reforms, i.e., the Conservative, Labour, Communist and the now disappearing Liberal parties, all claim though some of them would deny it, that there is nothing basically wrong with capitalism; nothing that cannot be remedied without abolishing the wages system and establishing a classless society. Thus all that it is necessary for workers to do is to follow the right "leaders," put their trust in promises and, given time, all would be well.

All of these parties have said and continue to say that the hardships and problems with which workers are plagued throughout their lives can be solved given the right leadership and the right policy.

The so-called Communist Party with its changing "cults" of worship is particularly hypocritical in this respect because its members are Communists in name only; obviously no party which believes that COMMUNISM (the abolition of the wages system, common ownership of the means of production and free access to wealth)

is the ONLY answer to poverty, housing problems, wars and unemployment would advocate reforms and try to solve these problems within capitalism.

By the time this article is read, another series of Borough Council elections will have been held and workers will tragically once again have voted for the politicians who run the system that robs them.

Once again all the afore-mentioned parties have all promised the same things and childishly blamed one another for past failures in bringing the same "houses for the homeless," "food for the hungry," "pensions galore" and "better roads," etc., as have been promised for many elections past.

One thing that should be glaringly obvious by now is that if any of them had ever redeemed their past promises there would be no need to keep coming back for re-election to do the same thing. This should clearly show to any thinking worker the utter futility of voting for any of them unless you want more in the future of what you have had in the past and if you do, then one could hardly call that thinking.

We wish here to pin-point just two of the problems of capitalism, and we have taken, for purposes of illustration, examples of each problem, one at home and one abroad. The idea is to show the world-wide nature of capitalism and its problems and also the world-wide nature of the only solution, SOCIALISM.

First let us look at the housing problem. It is quite obvious from the start that the whole approach of the Socialist Party of Great Britain is very different from and opposed to that of the afore-mentioned parties of capitalism.

We recognise that Prince Rainier and his bride, along with the rest of the class of parasites to which they belong, will not be found in Battersea flat hunting. Shortage of proper housing accommodation is essentially a working class problem and the reason that workers go without adequate housing is the same reason why they go without a great deal of the other things THEY produce; NOT because there is a shortage but because they cannot afford them—they have only very limited access to goods and services of all kinds because they do not own the fruits of their labour they only get WAGES—part payment.

In this wondrous era of H-power, automation and universal "plenty" we read in the *South London Press* (April 27th, 1956) that "Battersea's 3,000 housing applicants have no earthly chance of ever getting housed by the Borough." This sad information comes from a London County Councillor, Douglas Rayment, who, as a Conservative Party politician, has the impudence to say:—"Too many people sit back and wait for us to do something for them, instead of stirring themselves."

Was it not the Conservative Party whose Election Platform was based upon, among other things, the assertion that they could solve the housing problem?

Does not the Conservative Party at ALL elections issue reform programmes of what they are going to do for people who, having voted Conservative, can "sit back" and have the world brought to them on a platter?

The despairing and apathetic attitude of workers is part of the fruits of their having blindly voted for people who promise them things.

The Councillor and some of his colleagues go on to explain that "nearly all new housing in the Borough would go to people moved from slums," and, of the paltry 246 homes to be built in the "next five years" in "Winstanly Ward, only three go to housing applicants."

We are told of course that the L.C.C. is not to blame, nor is the Borough Council; it is the fault "of the central planning authority in not allowing sufficient density." It seems from this that the only thing which stops the L.C.C. and the Borough Council from packing dwellings (as they are aptly called) closer together and piling MORE people into the SAME space, is the central planning authority.

The point which all of these lamentable runners of capitalism miss, when trying to pardon their failure to run capitalism in the interests of the exploited majority, is that in their lying programmes they never say: "We will house you if slum dwellers do not move in from outside," or "We will solve the housing problem if materials are cheap enough for workers to afford the rents," or "We will bring peace unless war comes, prosperity, unless a slump comes and full employment unless unemployment sets in." Could it be that to tell workers the truth before polling would be dangerous to their chances of election?

The second problem at which we will glance has had a great deal said and written about it, namely that of RACE. We have ourselves published a 78 page pamphlet on this matter which explodes the false theories of biological superiorities and other such prejudices. It analyses the whole problem from the Socialist point of view and goes into the subject with much greater detail than space permits here. We need only mention one incident as an illustration.

In what is boasted as the most "advanced" country in the world where a lot of shouting is done about "constitutions," "citizens' rights," "freedom" and so on, a case is reported in the *Daily Express* (April 25th, 1956) of backward and ignorant conduct. The case being that of the segregation of negroes on 'buses in Montgomery, Alabama.

The facts as reported by the above newspaper indicate some "13 states with tough segregation laws" and a Police Commissioner, Sellers, who is a member of the so-called "White Citizens Council." The Supreme Court having ruled that segregation on 'buses must end, this man said: "As far as I am concerned this damn thing applies to South Carolina only." He threatened "to arrest any passenger who mixes with the opposite race."

Of course to carry this threat out would be impossible if the "advanced" individual in question had to define the terms "opposite race" and give evidence that would hold water before he went any further.

It is of particular interest to note that although this threat was made by the chief of police, the 'bus company, despite the fact that the threat also applied to 'bus "drivers who permitted racial mixing on their 'buses," sided with the Supreme Court ruling and told their employees they need no longer "give front seats to whites and rear seats to negroes."

We can understand the tenderheartedness of the 'bus company; they were merely responding in the way Capitalists normally do when their gold coffers have been hit. The 50,000 negroes of Montgomery have boycotted the 'buses since last December and this has lost the company "over £1,000 daily." The negroes, however, are keeping up their boycott "until the confusion is ended."

As Socialists we would say the action of the negroes in resisting this callous inequality is the only dignified and praiseworthy thing in the whole sordid and degrading affair.

The most tragic observation of all is not only that members of the working class should behave one to

another in such a way, resenting skin colours of fellow members of their own exploited class while their common enemies, the exploiting Capitalist class, live on their backs, but that the move away from segregation came from outside and not from within the states concerned. Unfortunately, the ignorance of the economic forces at work within capitalism, from which this conduct springs, cannot be banished merely by the Supreme Court making rulings although to whatever degree events turn against segregation it is a healthier sign than its unchallenged continuation.

It will finally only be when workers turn to SOCIALISM that they will cease to be a prey to nationalist or racial prejudice of one variety or another, because only then will they no longer see themselves as one with their respective NATIONAL ruling class, but will see that their real oneness lies in union with the wage slaves

all over the world, geography, sex and so-called race making no difference. We would conclude by saying that the "education" machine of capitalism whose function it is to turn out obedient, efficient wage slaves will never direct its efforts towards Socialism, but the hard facts of life and the common problems which universally smite all workers will direct their interest our way.

Meanwhile the politicians will go on with their "better world" promises and we for our part will go on vigorously advocating the abolition of the nightmare, which these hirelings seek to preserve, and its replacement by Socialism—the world of the social equality of all men and women of the world, of one community of interest based on holding the means of living in common, and production entirely and literally for use.

H.B.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

"Socialist Standard" Sales. Much has been said over the years regarding increasing the STANDARD sales, a certain means of putting over the case for Socialism. Ten thousand copies per month has been a target to aim for, but so far, a target not achieved. However, a special effort was made this May and 6,500 copies were ordered from the printer, and it is gratifying, particularly to the members who worked so hard, to know that they were all sold. Perhaps our target of 10,000 copies per month is not too ambitious, and if the result of the May sales drive is anything to go by bodes well. Comrades will be stimulated to add to this success by increasing the sales in the future.

Ealing Branch. The Branch's special May Sales Drive was extremely successful. Over One Thousand SOCIALIST STANDARDS (1,006 to be exact) were sold during the month, and 13 canvasses were held in all. New areas such as Northolt Park, Stonebridge Park, and St. Margaret's, Twickenham, were canvassed, as well as parts of other areas already known to members. The Branch undertook to take and pay for sixty dozen STANDARDS, i.e., there was to be no question of reclaiming from Head Office for unsold copies, but at the same time the Branch Literature Committee set itself the further and higher target of 1,000 copies. In spite of the strain which showed itself towards the end of the campaign, the excellent results thus far obtained encouraged members to carry on and reach the target. Such campaigns can obviously be made only on special occasions, but they do show what can be done when a real effort is made, and the scope that lies in canvassing for increasing the sales of the STANDARD.

The Branch's summer outing this year to Littlehampton took place on 10th June, and as usual proved very enjoyable, though a heavy shower of rain immediately after arrival, seemed to bode ill for the rest of the day. Fortunately, it was the only shower, and the weather afterwards, though not conducive to sunbathing, certainly acted as a stimulant to members' latent cricketing abilities.

Members may be interested to learn that Comrade Evans of the W.S.P. is visiting London on July 25th for a stay. Comrade Evans is an energetic and active member in Los Angeles.



Rugby. Encouraging news is to hand from Comrade Walsh who reports good literature sales. Members have attended public meetings in Coventry and Rugby and have sold a considerable number of May STANDARDS—several of these were sold at a meeting addressed by Father Huddleston, who bought a copy for himself.

Swansea. During the past twelve months, members of the branch have had 27 letters published in the "Swansea Voice," a local weekly paper. Numerous letters have also been published in other local newspapers, namely *The South Wales Evening Post*, *Western Mail* and *Llanelli Star* all stating the Party's attitude to questions of the day and topical events. The branch has received invaluable publicity as a result of these activities, and the Party's name is becoming well-known in the area. It is suggested that other branches, particularly those with restricted propaganda activities due to small membership, should take advantage of this useful means of publicising the Party.

Southend Branch has been well maintained, meetings commencing promptly with good attendances. Some new faces have done much to inspire the regular members and regular Sunday meetings have been successfully held over recent months. Canvassing for the STANDARD has been undertaken with success. The Branch looks forward to expanding activities in general and in addition carrying out a programme of outdoor meetings on the Sea Front. Members from other areas have in the past rendered assistance at these meetings at week-ends. Offers of assistance in advance would be most welcome. Write or

telephone H. G. Cottis, 109, Kingswood Chase, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, Tel. Leigh-on-Sea 75404.

Bloomsbury Branch. Meetings will be held during

THE PASSING SHOW

Cat out of the bag

Upton Sinclair once wrote that "even Von Papen had to tell the truth sometimes, if only to rest his mind." The saying applies to all politicians. The time comes when even the most diplomatic will blurt out the real motives of the British ruling class.

For example, Sir Anthony Eden. At Norwich recently he said:

The United Kingdom's vital interest in Cyprus is not confined to its N.A.T.O. aspect. Our country's industrial life and that of Western Europe depends to-day, and must depend for many years to come, on oil supplies from the Middle East. If ever our oil resources were in peril, we should be compelled to defend them. The facilities we need in Cyprus are part of that defence. We cannot, therefore, accept any doubt about their availability.—(The Times 2.6.56).

The Prime Minister here admits that British capitalism's need to protect its profits—which it could not do without oil supplies—comes before the promise which Britain has made, as a member of the United Nations, to uphold the principle of self-government. Socialists have been saying for a long time that capitalism always put profit before principle, but it is not often that a politician as eminent as Sir Anthony confirms it so explicitly.

Hobson's Choice

Do Socialists support self-determination? As the term is used now, they do not. Self-determination now means freedom for the workers to decide which group of Capitalists will exploit them. Socialists stand for a world in which there will be no exploitation, and in which, as a result, there will be no artificial division of the world into competing and warring states. No group will use war or terrorism as a means to gain independence, for not only will every country be independent, every individual will be independent too. There will be no foreigners under Socialism. The human beings of the world will freely participate in one voluntary society, because in that way will they best satisfy their needs.

Prophets of Doom

Whatever the condition of the country—whether there is war or peace, boom or slump—one factor, according to what we are told, remains constant and unchanged. It is this: if there are wage increases, disaster will overwhelm us all. Repeated warnings are poured out over the years by representatives of the ruling class: we must win the war, or we must reconstruct the country after the war, or we must defeat foreign competition. The use of "we," incidentally begs the question; these problems are problems of the ruling class, although, of course, the Capitalists will (and do) solve their problems more easily by fooling the workers into giving their support to the drive for war-supplies, or the drive for exports, or what-have-you.

July, but as usual will be discontinued during August as Conway Hall closes during that month. Branch members look forward to welcoming sympathisers and other members to the first meeting in September (Thursday 6th).

P. H.

Mr. MacMillan joins the chorus:

"At first our main competitors—Germany and Japan—were out of the race. Now they were coming along very fast. We must not relax; on the contrary, we must make even greater efforts. . . . Another round of wage increases such as there had been in the past two years would be disastrous." (The Times, 26.5.56).

The jest of the situation is this. The workers ask for wage-increases, not in the main to increase their share of the goods they produce (and thus reduce the amount of surplus value which is filched from them), but merely in order to maintain their present standards of living in face of constantly rising prices. And what makes prices rise? One of the main causes is that the amount of currency in circulation is continually being increased. And who has the chief say in deciding whether the amount of



"Take a 'Notice to all Staff.' To meet foreign competition, everyone connected with the firm will henceforward work twice as hard. This means 16 hours a day for the workers and two Annual General Meetings a year for the shareholders."

currency shall be increased? Mr. MacMillan! So Mr. MacMillan is in the position of berating the workers for actions which he himself has forced them into.

Honesty takes a back seat

The soap-and-detergent war among the three or four giant concerns which dominate the market for these goods continues. Each firm has three or more runners in the race, and the attention of the consumer is continually being assaulted by advertisements on the printed page, on hoardings, on the television screen and elsewhere, each claiming that product "A" (or "B," or "C") washes clothes cleaner than any of the others. All these allegations cannot be true. In a race it is just possible that all the competitors will arrive at the winning post at the same time; but it is impossible for each of the entrants in one race to beat all the others. But what do Capitalist concerns care for truth?

The sales of one product are boosted by means of a particularly shrewd trick. With each packet of this soap-powder is given—free!—a new duster. Buyers naturally assume they are getting more for their money than they did before this device was introduced. But in fact they get less. For the duster is placed inside the packet, thereby reducing the amount of soap-powder inside it. And the manufacturer saves more on the soap-powder than he has to pay for the scrap of cloth which constitutes the “free” duster.

The right attitude to the job

Mr. James Crawford is a paid trade union official—he is President of the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives. Recently he decided he would be serving his members' interests best by giving some advice to the boss on how to become popular with the workers. In a speech to the Annual Conference of the Advertising Association recently he declared:

“In British advertisements, the top executive—if he is not depicted as a harassed old man on the point of breaking down with an executive neurosis or ulcer—is at any rate seen to be a pretty smooth and leisurely type. This sort of thing builds up a mythical picture of the ‘boss’ in the minds of average employees, and is only a few points better than the Communist cartoonist's picture of a gross, top-hatted, cigar-smoking Satan, with his tail curling menacingly round his striped trousers. In American advertisements, the executive is much younger, much healthier, and has much more the appearance of a man who actually does some work. At times he is actually seen with his coat off, not sitting at a desk, but talking to the men on the job.” (*World's Press News*, 18.5.56).

U-MANIA

This writer, who calls the second part of dinner “afters” and proposes to go on doing so, is faced with a new menace. All his life the genteel alternative has been “sweet” or “dessert”: now, suddenly, it is “pudding.” Solid or fluid, wet or dry, pancake, pastry, blanc mange or rhubarb, “pudding” is to be its name. “Pudding” is “U.”

So is “vegetables,” but “greens” is non-U. Having “luncheon” is U, but “dinner”—except at night—is non-U. Saying “goodbye” is U, “bye-bye” non-U. Putting the milk in the tea is U, the tea in the milk non-U. To telephone from one's house is U, phoning from home non-U.

“U” stands for Upper-Class, “non-U” non-Upper-Class is phraseology and etiquette. The terms were first used by Professor Alan Ross, of Birmingham University in an article on “Linguistic Class-Indicators in Present-Day English” which was reprinted (having first appeared in a scholarly Finnish paper) in *Encounter*. They were popularized by *The Observer* and the *Sunday Express*, the leading agent and authority being Miss Nancy Mitford, the novelist.

What are the arbiters? By whose decree, what protocol or final judgment, is a word or a gimmick U or otherwise? One line of approach is suggested by a recent headline in the *Evening Standard*: GULLS EGGS, STRAWBERRIES HURLED AT PARTY: A DEBUTANT IS HIT IN THE EYE. Debutants are U; undoubtedly this was a U-party. The authentic U-touch, however, seems to be the hurling of gulls' eggs and strawberries. Hurling most things is just vulgar: BLACK PUDDINGS, KIPPERS HURLED AT PARTY: PLASTERER HIT IN THE EYE would be non-U from start to finish.

Mr. Crawford said the advertising profession should “help create among people at work the right attitude to the job.” Mr. Crawford is chairman of the Productivity Council, which has the task of increasing output. The ruling class has a high opinion of the “responsibility” and “common sense” of the majority of trade union leaders in this country; its confidence is evidently not misplaced in Mr. Crawford.

Life is grim, and life is earnest

From the *Sunday Express*, 15-4-56:

“Lady Portsmouth's daughters, Lady Phillipa, 18, and Lady Jane Wallop, 17, economise at their coming-out cocktail party next week by serving Spanish champagne—about five shillings a bottle cheaper than French non-vintage.”

But don't send round the hat yet. This isn't a permanent measure. “For their dance next month, which will probably be attended by Princess Alexandra, the champagne will be best French vintage.”

These upper-class parties are so much trouble that one wonders why anyone bothers to give them. In the *Sunday Express* of June 10th we find: “Lady Crosfield is again having difficulty in planning her annual pre-Wimbledon tennis party. . . . This year she finds that she has picked on the same day as the Garter ceremony at Windsor. ‘It is too late to alter my date, so I shall have no royalty here,’ she says.”

Life is full of tribulations, Lady Crosfield. But don't worry—you'll probably survive this one.

ALWYN EDGAR.

Miss Mitford told *Picture Post* in an interview published on May 12th that “money has nothing to do with being U,” but that is incomplete and therefore misleading. It is clear enough that people may be rich (“wealthy” is non-U) and not be U (the Grace Kelly wedding was “very non-U,” she said); it is equally clear, however, that nobody can be poor and U at the same time. Think of the cost in gulls' eggs and strawberries.

The real clue lies in the fact that, however silly and pointless the U-craze sounds, it isn't a craze and it isn't pointless. The speech and manners of the upper class are emblems as carefully worked and as proudly displayed as their heraldic crests. The hereditary rich learn them in the nursery and the public school (Miss Mitford says she learned U from her father, Lord Redesdale). Not all the rich have it that way, however; there are always the recruits, the successful speculators and the potato-crisp millionaires.

The best, most comprehensive beginners' book of U is at least as old as Miss Mitford. “*Manners and Rules of Good Society*, by a Member of the Aristocracy,” came out early in this century, and is still being reprinted. The chapter-headings tell their own tale: Introductions, Paying Calls, Precedency, Garden-Parties, Shaking Hands, Luncheons and 41 others. Here you find U-pronunciation: Blythe to be said Bly, Kerr Kar, Heathcote Hethcut and Montgomery Mungummary. As the author says in his preface:

“A solecism may be perhaps in itself but a trifling matter, but in the eyes of society at large it assumes proportions of a magnificent aspect, and reflects most disadvantageously upon the one by whom it is committed; the direct inference being, that to be guilty of a solecism argues the

offender to be unused to society, and consequently not on an equal footing with it.”

Thus, some people talk to establish their meaning and others to establish their status. That is why some modes of speech are thought better than others. Cockney, Liverpool and Newcastle dialects are not really looked-down on for philological reasons (some expressions like “gorn” and “orf,” are standard Cockney, and are also standard upper-class); the real point is that they are working-class idioms.

Does that explain the U-cult? Of itself, no. But there are lots of people who don't belong to the upper section but like others to think they do. Frank Richards's schoolboy stories, which were nine-tenths snobbery, made great fun of the fat boy's boast of “Bunter Court,” “an establishment that, seen close at hand, diminished to a semi-detached villa in Surrey.” And that is very near an all-too-common truth. Fancy calling a three-foot-wide passage “the hall!” Many people do. Fancy calling 12 feet square of living space “the lounge”—but they do.

The prop of the myth of “middle-class life” is its imitation of upper-class life. Not surprisingly, the upper class does not like it. The sham Tudor villas, the grained front doors, the imitation leather and the rest, are sneered at. Rather unfair of the upper class, because they can afford the real things, of course. Nevertheless, they

are in fact expressing resentment of the infringement of their patents. “U” is for upper-class; its antithesis, “non-U,” means—as the *Picture Post* article put it—“dreadfully middle-class.”

“Linguistic class-indicators” therefore are continually changing, and Miss Mitford and Professor Ross have virtually sponsored a new guide to them. The sad thing is that the eager suburbs have already lapped up a great deal of it so as to keep abreast in being O.K. socially. It is not the U-cult that is foolish—propertied classes seek every means to distinguish themselves from the rest—but the existence of the economic division which produces such things.

In the last ten years the people who are pleased to call themselves “middle-class”—teachers, parsons, civil servants and all—have pleaded their poverty perhaps more strongly than anyone; that is, they have demonstrated for all to see that their problems and interests are just the same as those of all the others who have to go to work for a living. And at just the same time, they have turned the passage into the hall, the settee into the sofa, Ralph into Rafe and the lavatory into the toilet in the hope that nobody will suspect the truth.

The upper class have at least one unassailable comeback. To try to be U is . . . definitely non-U.

R. COSTER.

RECENT EVENTS IN RUSSIA

Report of Meeting at Denison House

As was reported briefly in the May issue of the *SOCIALIST STANDARD* a successful meeting to put the Socialist estimate of recent changes in the situation in Russia was held at short notice at the Denison House Hall.

Two speakers stated the Party viewpoint. Comrade Darcy devoted his attention mainly to consideration of the international aspect of the question.

Comrade Young dealt chiefly with the Communist Party in this country.

Unfortunately, the raucous and rowdy elements who have been noticed around the Party platform at Hyde Park recently were conspicuous by their absence, preferring not to avail themselves of the opportunity to state the C. P. case inside the hall.

Even so, there were the usual individuals who heard for the first time that the Russian Government borrows vast sums upon which it regularly pays 4% interest.

Comrade Darcy quoted from the election speeches of Krushchev, Bulganin and Molotov (delivered in 1955) to show that they were still eulogising Stalin a year after his death.

He further drew attention to the impact of the international economic situation on Russian affairs. He thought that the renunciation of Stalin and the appeals for co-existence were the reflection of the Moscow Government's need for a larger share of world trade. The economic development of Russia would be bound to produce its political counterpart. The growth of the working class in that country would make it more difficult to run by simple police state methods.

Several amusing instances were given by the second speaker of the ludicrous position of the British Communist Party throughout the years. After quoting the *Daily Worker* to show that the articles on the death of Stalin were completely repudiated two years later, the speaker

gave examples of the antics of the Communists resulting from their lack of principles. Supporting the Labour Party in 1924—opposing it in 1929—supporting it in 1940 and 1945, supporting the war, opposing it—supporting it.

Calling on the unemployed to march to the military barracks at Burnley and fraternise with the soldiers, only to find them empty, and converted into slum property.

With reference to the so-called “day-to-day” struggle, the speaker read two extracts, one from the *Daily Worker* and one from the *Workers Weekly*.

“Many times we lightmindedly call for strike action without the semblance of preparation having been made, so that in some districts, when workers see our comrades, they are apt to say, ‘Hullo, what are we to strike for to-day?’”—*Daily Worker*, January 25th, 1932.

“The unemployed have done all they can, and the Government know it. They have tramped through the rain in endless processions. They have gone in mass deputations to the Guardians.”

They have attended innumerable meetings and have been told to be “solid.” They have marched to London enduring terrific hardships. *All this has led nowhere.*—*Workers Weekly*, February 10th, 1923.

Italics ours.

Both speakers emphasised the repeated declaration of the Socialist Party that the fundamental mistake of the Bolsheviks was their illusion of minority action.

Socialism can only be majority action.—Democracy. As a result their policies resulted in increasing disaster, throwing “Communists” in this country into even greater confusion and panic.

Numerous questions were answered and an interesting discussion took place in which various points of view were expressed. One contributor thought there might be a likelihood of a genuine democratic advance in Russia

Continued on page 111

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

JULY



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

WHO WILL SWITCH ON THE LIGHTS FOR THE ELECTRICIANS?

THE Electrical Trades Union has been having a spot of bother about its Executive's gift of £20 to a fund to provide legal aid for Cypriots arrested under Emergency Regulations. Much heat was generated in the dispute between members who disapproved and others who approved—much heat but no light. Outsiders soon joined in, including the *Sunday Express* (10 June, 1956) with a demand for the curbing of the power of the E.T.U.; defenders of British Colonialism who call the Cypriots "terrorists," and opponents who call them "Patriots"; and critics of the "Communist" officials of the E.T.U. The latter defended their action on the ground, among others, that it is right and proper for a trade union to come to the aid of other trade unionists when denied a "fair trial." Nothing wrong with this of course but one wonders if it extended to the numerous Russian workers now admitted to have been "framed" under the Stalin régime.

In the public controversy much excitement centred round the alleged Communism of the E.T.U. officials and the merits of the Cypriot movement against British rule but as is usual on such occasions the working class and Socialist viewpoints were not heard.

There is no evidence whatever that the officials of the E.T.U. who acted as spokesmen in the affair are interested in Communism, and abundant evidence to the contrary. Members or sympathisers of the Communist Party they may be, but this long ago ceased to mean an interest in Communism. What it now implies is a muddle-headed belief that State Capitalism is the same as Socialism or Communism, and that this is a fine thing provided it is administered by the Russian Communist Party not by the British Labour Party. If the E.T.U. officials had been supporters of Communism they would be internationalists

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD July, 1956

and opponents of State Capitalism everywhere. They would be trying to convince the electricians that Russian State Capitalism is no more deserving of working class support than is the Electricity Board in Britain, that is not at all, and that the growing competition of Russia in world markets is no more a matter for congratulation by British or Russian workers than is American conquest of markets a matter for congratulation by American workers. They would be trying to get misguided workers in Britain, Cyprus and everywhere else, to recognise that Nationalist movements are of use only to the Capitalists and do nothing but harm to the workers of the world. A united trade union movement acting internationally to further working class interests against all the governments of capitalism and all the employers, everywhere, would achieve something for the workers, which no Nationalist movement ever did.

Unable to point to positive benefits to the workers through support of Nationalist movements their propagandists often take refuge in the vague abstraction that movements for national independence are in favour of "freedom" and should therefore receive the approval of "lovers of freedom." The one freedom Socialists are interested in, freedom from capitalism, is opposed by nationalists but even within the framework of capitalism the identification of Nationalism with libertarian ideas is false. Every Nationalist movement of modern times has built itself up on the directly opposite doctrine, that of forcing unwilling or indifferent people to support it in the last resort at the point of the gun. No Nationalist movement is ever content to let people freely choose; always the resort is to force. Cyprus is no exception in presenting the spectacle of Cypriot Patriots shooting other Cypriots for choosing not to support the independence movement. And the long history of sentimental movements by "friends of freedom" to help Nationalists gain their independence has been littered with the examples of "ex-prisoners turned jailers," of national groups, having gained independence, turning to suppress some other group. And so it will go on while capitalism lasts.

Socialists therefore do not support Nationalist movements and do not support the efforts of other Capitalist groups to suppress Nationalist movements. Instead Socialists try to induce the workers to recognize their interest in Socialism and in the internationalism that goes with it, in opposition to Capitalism and its tool, Nationalism.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day	1/- (Post free 1/3)
The Socialist Party and War	1/- (" " 1/3)
Russia Since 1917	1/- (" " 1/3)
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years	1/- (" " 1/3)
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis	1/- (" " 1/3)
Socialism	4d. (" " 6d.)
Socialism or Federal Union?	4d. (" " 6d.)
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy	4d. (" " 6d.)
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?	4d. (" " 6d.)
Nationalisation or Socialism?	6d. (" " 8d.)

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD July, 1956

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," July, 1906)

A Working Man's Education

It is difficult to see what connection the present "Education" Bill or the outcry regarding it has with education itself. Indeed, the frothy struggle for religious domination almost completely obscures the really important matter beneath.

Most people do not distinguish between education proper and the mere imparting of information, but the distinction is vital. To educate is not to merely pack the brain with facts or cut and dried formulae, but is to bring out the powers of the mind, to train the faculties for the reception and use of life's present experience and of the knowledge handed down from the past; to prepare the mind for the first-hand gathering of knowledge, and the co-ordination and right use of it.

To fill children's minds with facts and dead formulae whose inner significance is not understood may make excellent parrots, but cannot make thinkers. Such a procedure causes a one-sided, mechanical development, and

leads to a taste for snippety bits. It does not enable the mind to draw useful knowledge from the facts of life; it brings about an incapacity for sustained and logical thinking, and creates a habit of mind that is eagerly receptive of superficials, but in no wise creative.

Naturally... we find that the quality of the worker's instruction is traceable to the demands of the prevailing methods of wealth production. There is no necessity to the Capitalist of a mass of fully-educated, original-minded and high-spirited men as wage-slaves; they would be in the way, and far too costly. The necessities of the day demand workers who are mechanical, one-sidedly developed, and eminently submissive. It is necessary to the Capitalist, not only that the workers be not taught things which may injure his domination, but also that they be trained so far and no farther; that they be disciplined in routine work, and fitted with just sufficient knowledge to do the worker's work cheaply and fairly efficiently.

THE FILMS

"Storm Centre"

This film is a timely reminder that the spirit of McCarthyism is not yet dead—only a little less vociferous. In fact, it can fairly confidently be said that this spirit will not die as long as capitalism lives. As long as it serves a political or economic end to have purges, scapegoats or witch-hunts—which means for the duration of capitalism—then these things will continue.

It is welcome, however, to find a film from Hollywood which is openly hostile to "red-baiting," though of course, the makers of the film had difficulty in getting it made at all, and no doubt the next time that the Un-American Activities Committee turn their attention to Hollywood, they will pounce on this film with glee.

The story is simple—An elderly woman librarian in a small American town refuses to remove from the library a book on "Communism" which the City Council find embarrassing. As one might expect in the land of the free, she is branded as a "red," ostracised, and her life made impossible generally. The little boy whom she befriends and encourages in his love of books, becomes disillusioned, and with his father goading him with talk of reds, spies and Communists, is eventually driven to the verge of insanity, and expresses his neurotic confusion by burning down the library. However, the film's simplicity carries with it conviction, at least for a substantial part of the plot, but what makes the film so disturbing is its deliberate understatement of its case. One is not presented with the McCarthys, the Kohns or the Shines of the American scene, but with the "nice, ordinary people," who, with their bigotry, stupidity, and political infancy, violently rush to defend "democracy" and "the American way of life," and become the oppressors. This provides a striking parallel with the burners-of-books, the Jew-baiters, and the racial persecutors of the maligned "un-democratic" nations, and indeed the film stresses this parallel in the symbolism of the burning of the library.

The characterisation of the film is good, Bette Davis

being extremely convincing as the librarian, although somewhat more restrained than in her more youthful days. Kim Hunter and Joe Mantell (who made a good first impression as "Ange" in "Marty"), also give extremely effective performances, the latter as the boy's All-American father who eventually drives the boy crazy by his talk of subversion, Communists, and "Pinko-talk."

As one would expect, a happy ending is engineered, albeit somewhat unconvincingly. The burning of the library and the tragedy of the boy's mental state brings the City Council to their senses, and all is forgiven. One is left in doubt, however, as to whether the forces that were at work hysterically crying "red" would be appeased by this, and when one considers that many of the persecuted political "suspects" do not have the advantages of influential friends and happy circumstance that this librarian has, one appreciates that the real situation is much worse. In fact, political intolerance in America, with the suicides, imprisonings, exiles, and ruined lives that it leaves in its wake, is little less evil (if at all) than similar products of the Capitalist world in the "iron-curtain" countries or in former Nazi Germany, or even this country for that matter, if the dismissal of Mr. John Lang from I.C.I. is a reliable manifestation.

This film is a clear reflection of American liberal opinion which is openly hostile to McCarthy, political and judicial corruption, and other less pleasant aspects of God's own country. It is at pains to point out that McCarthyism, censorship, and the like, are denials of the very freedoms which Americans claim differentiate them from the "dictatorships." Actually though, it is the unscrupulous up-and-coming politician in the film who really gives the game away from the Socialist point of view. He states that practically any step is justified in order to save America, and goes on to explain that a country at war, whether hot, cold or lukewarm, must be drastic in

its measures, and that if innocent people get crushed in the process, it is just too bad. Of course, whether the Liberals like it or not, that is in fact the position, and that beside the fundamentals of Capitalist cut-throat competition, all talk of freedom and democracy is just so

much hot air. In spite of this, and of the artificial ending, the points that the film makes are valid and telling, and apart from the not inconsiderable value of the drama itself, make this a worth-while film.

A. W. I.

PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIALISM

THE famous thinkers of modern times are easily named and their realms identified: Darwin for evolution, Einstein for relativity and so on. That is as far as it goes for most of us, and it is much less easy to be aware of their influence on everyday life and thought. There is no doubt, however, of the influence of Sigmund Freud, whose birth-centenary was celebrated recently. "Ego," "inhibition" and "unconscious" are words in daily use; people as a matter of course comment on others' behaviour in terms of complexes and subconscious wishes.

In a television programme on May 13th, eminent men testified to Freud's influence in many fields of thought. "All anthropology today assumes the Freudian view of human character," said Professor Blackburn. "Through the teaching of Freud we are forced to pay attention to the personality of the delinquent . . . rather than what he has done," said Professor Sprott. Cyril Connolly spoke of the Freudian inroad on literature—"we're all still reading from it"—and another speaker quoted the Catholic Charles Baudouin: "Modern man cannot conceive of himself without Freud."

Anniversary tributes are always lavish, of course. Nevertheless, there can be no question of the part psychological theory and psychiatric practice have come to play in modern life. The classic doctrines remain their basis. Freud himself, with his emphasis on "the Unconscious," the mass of repressed thought and memory, is pre-eminent. His one-time followers, Jung and Adler, proposed other driving-forces of behaviour for Freud's sexuality: for Adler it was power-striving, for Jung "the Libido," a generalized force giving rise to all creative activity. In the study of conscious thought, the Behaviourists led by Pavlov and Watson have stated and exemplified the doctrine of the conditioned reflex, which was described by Bertrand Russell in "The Scientific Outlook" as "the basis of learning, of what the older psychologists called the 'association of ideas,' of the understanding of language, of habit, and of practically everything in behaviour that is due to experience."

In addition to these two main schools, there are several branches of psychology dealing with specific aspects of behaviour. For example, there are the "investigators of intelligence" whose conclusions still hold sway in the educational world and their tests applied as measures of innate abilities. Many others, too: group behaviour, leadership, art, crime, all have come in the psychologists' orbit.

More than anything else, psychology is an attempt at a solution, and before there is a solution you must have a problem. Freud's theories grew out of his own clinical research into cases of hysteria and neurasthenia; the existence of a study of the mind implies the growth of mental and emotional disorder in the modern world. True, there were disordered minds before modern times—

Shakespeare wrote about them, Nero seems a clear case of paranoia—and before the statistics. Nevertheless, there is no question of the tremendous growth of such illness in the twentieth century. No big hospital today is without its staff of psychiatrists.

The central theme of Freudian psychology is the supposition of an unconscious mind, receiving the impressions of experience and shaping, like an unseen hand, the acts and motives of conscious life. "The unconscious," wrote Trotter in *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, "is the realm of all the experiences, memories, impulses and inclinations which during the subject's life have been condemned by the standards of the conscious, have proved incompatible with it and have therefore been outlawed from it. This banishment in no way deprives these excluded mental processes of their energy, and they



"My trouble is I keep talking to myself Doctor"

constantly influence the feelings and behaviour of the subject. So strict, however, is the guard between them and the conscious that they are never allowed to pass the barrier between one sphere and the other except in disguised and fantastically distorted forms by which their true meaning is closely concealed."

That is all very well as far as it goes. There is nothing far-fetched in the idea of a fantasy-life as a source of conflict and frustration and ultimately illness; indeed, it is only too recognizable. The converts to religion are seeking stability and assurance which ordinary life does not give them; the film-star and speedway worshippers, the tough novel addicts are only snatching at second-hand emotional satisfactions. If one grants, however, that fear, guilt and unhappiness may be rooted in the subconscious, there is still the fact that the subconscious and the conscious both are rooted in society. Consciousness of itself has no meaning: man, the social animal, has only social consciousness.

To some extent psychiatrists are compelled to recognize this. A good deal of their work amounts to rehabilitation rather than anything else—finding different jobs, recommending for re-housing and so on. This writer once saw the line of waiting patients for psychiatric treatment in a London hospital: written over them, as plain as the marks of a physical beating, were the signs of poverty and care and the fact that what they really needed most was an extra ten pounds a week apiece. That is why generally psychiatrists are as impotent as most other therapists, trying to cure the complaint without removing its cause.

It is a mistake to brush off the question of psychiatry as an amusing vogue for idle rich people or a refuge for nuts and ninnies. The first suggestion was tested in America a few years ago by two Yale investigators who grouped all the mental cases in one city—New Haven—according to income and social background. By far the greatest proportion (36.8 per cent.) came from the bottom group of unskilled poorly-paid workers with incomplete elementary education. To debunk psychiatry does not explain why currently one person in twenty in America or one in sixteen in Britain is finding his way to a mental hospital at some time or other—to say nothing of the aspirin addicts.

Our complex, class-divided society imposes a thousand and one repressions on its people, from the material discomforts which turn lively girls into nagging wives to the ulcerating strain of city life and the loneliness of the crowd. Fear is ubiquitous in modern life: not man's sensible fear of physical danger, but a multitude of small relations of it. The insecurity from which no-one is free means perpetual fear of losing one's job, of illness, of being unable to pay the instalments, of dropping places in the contemporary caste-race called "standards of living." The case was stated very well in a broadcast on *Crime Comics and the American Way of Life* by Irving Sarnoff, in March last year:

"Unfortunately, not every American can get more. Unfortunately, too, the very process of striving after more, by foul means or fair, pits person against person in an endless struggle. For those who cannot show constant increments, the struggle is especially bitter. . . . Paradoxically, success is so often dependent upon the masking of the very antagonisms engendered by the struggle, that we are required to wear an armour of good humour, compliance, duplicity and detachment. Nevertheless, the inner anger remains and finds devious outlets in psychosomatic complaints, insanity, divorce and crime."

Only it isn't exclusively American, of course. And to all of that may be added the host of petty anxieties reflected in present-day advertising, the basis of which seems to be that you can sell most of a thing by making people afraid to be without it. Thus, the accent is on fear of not getting on; of leaving one's family unsupported; of the social and sexual consequences of off-white shirts, perspiration and strong breath.

This is perhaps the appropriate point to refer to the Behaviourists. Pavlov's and Watson's experiments are so well known as to need little description. Show a dog food, and its mouth waters; ring a bell at the same time, and eventually its mouth waters at the sound of the bell; unless its cerebral hemispheres have been removed.

Or have a child play with a white rat; scare the child with a bang, and soon it fears the rat. The possibilities for manipulating behaviour were so extensive, in fact, as to lead to the conclusion that thought itself was but the inward expression of conditioned reflexes. Watson wrote: "States of consciousness provide no objective data that admits of scientific examination, nor can the behaviourists find any evidence for mental existence of any kind."

Conditioned reflexes are recognizable enough in the modern world. See them in the woman's magazine adulation of royalty; the wartime hatred of the other side; the emotional stirrings to a hymn or a military band; the advertisements for every washing-powder. And the fact is that the Behaviourists discovered nothing in the laboratory that others have not found out empirically. Bernard Shaw, as acute at some times as he was silly at others, is recorded as having said when Pavlov's treatise was first published: "If the fellow had come to me I could have given him that information in less than 25 seconds without tormenting a single dog."

It was probably true. Advertizing and salesmanship practise as a matter of course what Behaviourism preaches as a matter of theory (and other departments of psychology too. The magazines of popular psychology invoke Freud and Jung, but their material is the sell-more-and-get-on doctrine of *How to Win Friends and Influence People*). The Behaviourists' conclusions about the nature of thought conclude only how little is yet known about thought. The brain and nervous system have been charted, the parts named which are associated with some mental processes—and that is virtually all.

K. S. Lashley, after a long series of experiments, could say no more than "the learning process and the retention of habit are not dependent on any finely localised structural changes within the cerebral cortex" and "the mechanisms of integration are to be sought in the dynamic relations among the parts of the nervous system rather than in details of structural differentiation." And again, of his findings from mutilating the brains of rats: "Such facts can only be interpreted as indicating the existence of some dynamic function of the cortex which is not differentiated in respect to single capacities, but is generally effective for a number to which identical neural elements cannot be ascribed." These, from Lashley's "Brain Mechanisms and Intelligence," are among the most positive statements made on thought and habit, and they are so tentative as to be almost speculative.

One aspect of psychology certainly should not be overlooked. Whatever knowledge of individual and collective behaviour has been gained is used to further the interests of the ruling class: to tame the recalcitrant and choose the efficient worker, to boost morale in wartime and help productivity in the factory. The social psychology of industry is a product of the last 80 years, the era of relative surplus-value—when exploitation has taken the form of squeezing and cajoling more out of the worker in a shorter working day.

That psychology has thrown side-lights on human behaviour is true, though the evidence suggests that the same would have been forthcoming from other sources. It raises questions—but fails to answer them. Freud saw that 19th century civilization was bad for people, but he offered no alternative. The psycho-therapist deals with introspection, with repression, tension and anxiety as per-

sonal conditions when in reality they are social conditions. Individual mental illnesses may be cured in the same way as one man's ulcer may be excised—and the way of living which produces thousands more remain.

A million acts of charity point to but do not remedy an economic condition of poverty. Similarly, psychology

THE SILLINESS OF BERNARD SHAW AND THE WEBBS

Reynolds News (10 June, 1956), in the course of publishing condensed extracts from "Beatrice Webb's Diaries 1924-1932," had the following about Beatrice's disapproval of Bernard Shaw for his admiration of Mussolini:—

"October 21st, 1927. G. B. S. has created something of a sensation; he has gone out of his way to certify to the excellence of Mussolini's dictatorship—to its superiority over political democracy as experienced in Britain and other countries. . . . G. B. S. fortified in his admiration of Mussolini by spending eight weeks and £600 in a luxurious hotel at Stresa; in continuous and flattering interviews with Fascist officials of charming personality and considerable attainments. . . ."

"From the published correspondence in the English Press and still more from a private correspondence with Adler, it appears that G. B. S. puts forward the Mussolini regime as the *New Model* which all other countries ought to follow!"

Of course later on, in the second world war, Shaw hedged about his admiration for the Italian dictator, but in the meantime the Webbs had made the pilgrimage to Moscow, fallen for the same blandishments and published their massively misguided book "Soviet Communism—a new Civilisation." One of its unintentionally humorous chapters is that on "Is Stalin a Dictator?" "Sometimes it is asserted," they wrote (second edition, 1937, page 431), "that, whereas the form may be otherwise, the fact is that, whilst the Communist Party controls the whole administration, the Party itself, and thus indirectly the whole

underlines but offers no solution to a problem of society. The answer cannot lie in "adjustment" for individuals: is it to be adjustment to a rotten society? The only real solution lies in changing the structure of society itself.

R. COSTER.

State, is governed by the will of a single person, Josef Stalin."

They hastened to point out (doubtless remembering their earlier disapproval of Shaw and Mussolini) that Stalin, unlike Mussolini and Hitler, was "not invested by law with any authority over his fellow-citizens. . . . He is, in fact, only the General Secretary of the Party. . . ."

In their solemn-silly way they concluded that there wasn't any truth in the stories about Stalin!

"We have given particular attention to this point, collecting all the available evidence, and noting carefully the inferences to be drawn from the experience of the past eight years (1926-1934). We do not think that the Party is governed by the will of a single person; or that Stalin is the sort of person to claim or desire such a position. He has himself very explicitly denied any such personal dictatorship in terms which, whether or not he is credited with sincerity certainly accord with our own impression of the facts."

How Stalin must have laughed up his sleeve at such simplicity; and how his "reformed" successors must laugh at the simplicity of the Webb's successors.

Of course the biggest deception of the Webbs' book—a deception still being practised by Stalin's heirs—was that Russian dictatorship-ridden State capitalism was a "new civilisation." It deserves that title as much as did Mussolini's Italy deserve Shaw's belief in it as a *New Model*.

H.

THE CRITICS CRITICISED

Professor Popper Looks at History

(Continued from June Issue)

MR. POPPER'S own evaluation of history can hardly claim any scientific pretensions. In the main he largely garbles the anti-Christian Nietzsche's "power drive theory of history." With Mr. Popper this power drive reveals itself in the history of political power which, he says, "has been elevated into world history." This political power drive theory is explained by Mr. Popper as the impulse to worship or be worshipped. He repeats Schopenhauer that man's besetting sin, is making power synonymous with success. This worship of power it seems is due to fear (p. 272) although (same page) he appears to have changed his mind and made the power drive one of instinct which in that case makes him a Bertrand Russell adherent. This, then, is Mr. Popper's theoretical contribution to the understanding of our times. One might add in passing that to grasp the significance of political power or any aspect of social power lies not in assumptions about some neurotic impulse or instinct but in an analysis of the historical conditions and social formations which explain not only the nature of political power but why different societies have thrown up different forms of political organisations. When this is done the

power drive theory of history becomes supernumary.

Mr. Popper has quite mistaken notions as to what constitutes history. For him, technocracy, political power, historical records, etc., are history. In fact they are not history, but the outcome of history. History itself is the story of man—not this man or that man but socially organised man in pursuit of his ends under given and determinate conditions. Since the passing of primitive society the pursuit of these ends has taken place via the agency of social groups whose aims and interests have been conflicting ones. It is by an examination of these social productive relations—the economic factor—that we reveal the rise and fall of institutions, traditions, politics, ideologies and other cultural phenomena and thus allow a theory of historical causation to become possible.

Marxism is an attempt then to show the prime causal factors in the evolution of human society. In spite of Mr. Popper's efforts to show that Marxism believes there are mysterious impersonal forces in history which shape man's destiny, it is no more mysterious than other evolutionary concepts which seek to account for development in other fields.

Men make history Marxists contend and what some men have made, other men can understand. In this way history becomes an intelligible process and the past capable of being reconstructed by the same pattern of enquiry which marks other fields of scientific investigation. In the light of this, Mr. Popper's remarks that men have only faked history seems more than a little foolish.

Mr. Popper is unoriginal enough to seek to be original and daring and too often succeeds in being merely dull and pretentious. He plays to the gallery by announcing that all the history which exists, i.e., our history of the great and powerful, is a shallow comedy. He brings in the usual gods whose function it is apparently to mock at human affairs and they indulge in the conventional guffaws at our expense. At other times he converts the comedy into crude melodrama by assuring us that the history which is advertised as the history of mankind is but the history of international crime and mass murder (p. 270).

Mr. Popper's views on history seem to waver between a cloak and dagger conspiracy and another version of the fall of man. Neither of them can validly explain the actual evolution of human society: Why it has pointed in a determinate direction, viz., primitive society, slavery, feudalism, capitalism. And why in that order.

In spite of the nonsense talked about by Mr. Popper, Isaiah Berlin and others, that "historic inevitability" is another name for an automatic impersonal force which supposedly operates in history, Marx's views on history were sharp and clear. Human effort and struggle he held were the means which brought about the historically determined. He never sought to make history a mystery. Indeed he claimed that history had no greater reality than that which could be discovered by the analysis of actual historical events. While unlike Hegel he never believed that history was the outcome of logic and reason, he nevertheless believed that it could be rationally explained.

Marx had then a view point on history. He did not believe it could be explained by abstractions like power drives or impulses. Nor it might be added by spirit, nature or some economic first cause. For Marx history had no purpose which was not the purpose of man. No goals which are not human goals. It is men who will to do things. But what men will is always contrameneous with elements in the social situation which are unwilling. Because society is a continuous process, men always find themselves in a set of conditions which is given. It is these conditions which give the scope and set the stamp

on particular social aims and goals. When and whether they will be effectively realised will depend upon the objective possibilities within the social situation. It is true for instance that Socialism must be willed by men but it is not until a particular set of social relations namely capitalism, appear, can there arise the objective means for Socialism to be realised. Marx's theory of historic causation explains then why men in different historic phases seek to achieve certain ends and what have been the nature of the circumstances which have allowed them to succeed—or fail. Critics of Marx have seized upon the term "objective" conditions, isolated it from its context and then accused Marx of propounding a prime mover on economic first cause which propel men along some predetermined path. Mr. Popper is an incorrigible exponent of this type of distortion.

It has already been noted that Mr. Popper's conception of history, i.e., the story of power politics, technocracy, historical records, etc., is not history, even though each of them has a history, and even when he presents them as history he converts them into a masquerade of power drives and neurotic impulses. Because Mr. Popper denies there is any valid continuity, any causal connection in social development, he asserts it is only we who live in the present, who can change things not something called history. Almost a century before Marx had said: "Things cannot remain that way, they must become different and we human beings must make them different." Indeed the whole purpose of Marx's teaching was that only by understanding capitalism and acting upon that understanding would we be effective in changing it to something better.

Mr. Potter wants something better. He refers vaguely to the need of justice, democracy, equality, without any real reference to the social context. His own assertion that something called historicism alias Marxism sees men as pawns in some inevitable cosmic evolution which ignores their personal aims and attitudes, renders politics null and void, and allows "the social scientists to say what shall or shall not be done," is a sheer invention on his part. He refers innocuously to the brotherhood of man but he has no serious quarrel with the present set up. He fails to recognise that the removal of class privilege based on productive ownership must be the indispensable and elementary step for achieving that "brotherhood."

(To be continued).

E. W.

INFLATION—AND DEFLATION

"In so far as the payments balance one another, money functions only ideally as money of account, as a measure of value. In so far as actual payments have to be made, money does not serve as a circulating medium, as a mere transient agent in the interchange of products, but as the individual incarnation of social labour, as the independent form of existence of exchange value, as the universal commodity. This contradiction comes to a head in those phases of industrial and commercial crises which are known as monetary crises. Such a crisis occurs only where the ever-lengthening chain of payments, and an artificial system of settling them, has been fully developed. Whenever there is a general and extensive disturbance of this mechanism, no matter what its cause,

money becomes suddenly and immediately transformed, from its merely ideal shape of money of account, into hard cash. Profane commodities can no longer replace it. The use-value of commodities becomes valueless, and their value vanishes in the presence of its own independent form. On the eve of the crisis, the bourgeois, with self-sufficiency that springs from intoxicating prosperity, declares money to be a vain imagination. Commodities alone are money. But now the cry is everywhere: money alone is a commodity. As the hart pants after fresh water, so pants his soul after money, the only wealth." ("Capital," pages 154-155, chapter 3, on "Money or the Circulation of Commodities," Kerr edition.)

CORRESPONDENCE

The following letter of criticism of the S.P.G.B. has been received from a S. Wales reader of the "S.S."

Llanelli.

A little while ago I came across a copy of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. As I perused its pages, a surge of thought carried me back some 30 odd years to the days of my boyhood. I could see once again, the street corner where a group of derelict men listened to the speaker on the platform. I moved forward and there painted in front of the platform were the words "Socialist Party Gt. Britain." I recalled the mental agility of the speaker; the art of vective when the occasion arose and the good humoured banter with which he raised a laugh—in days when there was little to laugh about. When I looked at the "S.S." recently I shook my head sorrowfully and asked "What has the S.P.G.B. accomplished during those years?"

To the general public, the words "Socialist" and "Labour" are synonymous and any attempt to tell them that there is an organization known as the S.P.G.B., whose policy is different from Labour, would meet with wide eyed amazement. Has, therefore, the philosophy of my street corner orator of long ago been of no avail?

The basis of any true Socialist society must include the principles of your party. But is your party likely to achieve its aim when, with half the century gone, it has yet to gain a seat in Parliament? I take it that you desire to gain that distinction, for it would seem that without Parliamentary representation and ultimate majority, the S.P.G.B. is just a wasted effort.

I have no doubt the party contains many able men but while other parties strive to gain control of the country the S.P.G.B. do nothing and its propaganda makes about as much noise as a weathercock on a steeple.

Regarding the Labour Party. Although there is a divergency of views within it which weakens it, it is, however, a party of the people and commands the support of those for whom there is no other party to which they can turn in an effort to oust capitalism. Can we, as members of the public be expected to support a party which has no voice in the affairs of the country? For such as myself, Labour gives a glimmer of hope that there is a chance that from it may yet evolve a Socialist Government.

It is possible that one may have to sacrifice one's Socialist Principles to gain one's Socialist Ideal.

Does the word "Socialist" appeal to the public? I don't think so. The S.P.G.B. can never become a popular party by retaining its present title. During the war, Richard Acland's Commonwealth Party rapidly gained new friends. I'm sure the secret lay in the name.

These remarks are intended to be constructive. They may be wide of the mark with regard to the aims of your party but the sympathies of the writer are with Socialism.

J. WILLOCK.

REPLY.

Someone once said "The road to Hell is paved with good intentions." Mr. Willock, like many more at the present time stands bewildered amidst the chaos of capitalism hoping that the Labour Party will justify its existence.

The fact that, despite the control of Parliament, and a multitude of reformist schemes, Mr. Willock still looks for a "glimmer of hope" that the Labour Party will one day become Socialist, is indeed significant. Perhaps our correspondent agrees that the Labour Party has never been Socialist, is not Socialist, and shows no hope of becoming Socialist (we have no way of knowing how much hope Mr. Willock finds in a "glimmer.")

Having apologised for the Labour Party Mr. Willock then goes on to criticise the S.P.G.B.—a Socialist organization. He says that "Socialism" and "Labour" are synonymous to the general public. Quite true; it is something we too deplore. For Mr. Willock's "glimmer of hope" to become somewhat brighter one would suggest that the Labour Party begins now to advocate Socialism. Unfortunately such a thing would be quite impossible for that organization short of disbanding itself. Its members who become Socialists could with very little trouble join the Socialist organization already existing—namely the S.P.G.B.

Our correspondent goes on to say that without Parliamentary representation the S.P.G.B. is a wasted effort. He also says we do nothing to propagate our views. Really Mr. Willock? The S.P.G.B. certainly does propagate the view that it is of prime importance to capture Parliament (see our Declaration of Principles), but surely in order to capture Parliament for Socialism the majority must understand and want Socialism. Mr. Willock unconsciously condemns himself when he criticises us for not having captured Parliament. It is only Mr. Willock and the rest of the working class who can capture Parliament, the S.P.G.B. can be their instrument for doing so—if they desire it.

Mr. Willock, having admitted that Socialism must include the Principles of our Party, still doggedly tries to find another excuse for the lack of support he and others show towards Socialism. He points out the "need" for a change of title, and uses the Commonwealth Party as his unfortunate illustration. Since he has a sneaking regard for the S.P.G.B. one wonders why in the name of common sense does he still cling to his "glimmering hope" the Labour Party. Seriously, does our correspondent think any gain would be forthcoming by trying to "sell" Socialism by any other name, does he think it would work: *Is he ashamed of Socialism?*

He asks what have we accomplished? What, may we ask, does he expect us to accomplish? The real point to remember is that *the small band of Socialists accomplishes little itself but the working class can accomplish what it wills when it wills it.* It is up to our correspondent and others to bring Socialism about, not by doling out wise advice but rather by setting an example.

Finally, now that our correspondent has once again contacted the S.P.G.B. (an example of the S.P.G.B. propagating Socialism) he should continue to read and criticise. His view that one should sacrifice Socialist principles in order to foster Socialist Ideals is quite illogical. Not to hold Socialist principles in a Capitalist society is to support capitalism.

W. BRAIN.

"RECENT EVENTS IN RUSSIA"—continued from page 103

due to working class maturity.

Others questioned this view, asking for evidence for the statement that there had been any real change there, seeing in the "new Party line" just one more adroit manoeuvre.

A request was also made for still further consideration of this aspect of the business, which some thought inadequately dealt with by the meeting.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form overleaf.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ...	3.30—6 p.m. and 7—10 p.m.
East Street (Walworth) ...	July 1st 11 a.m.
	" 8th 12.30 p.m.
	" 15th 11 a.m.
	" 22nd 12.30 p.m.
	" 29th 11 a.m.
Whitestone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

MONDAYS

Heron Court, Richmond ... 8 p.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

Station Road, Ilford ... 8 p.m.

SATURDAYS

Jolly Butchers Hill ... 7.30 p.m.

(Nr. Wood Green Stn.) ... 3.30 p.m.

Ealing Green ... 3.30 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Lincoln's Inn Fields, Tuesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m.

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

SUMMER SCHOOL

It is proposed to run a Summer School, September 29th and 30th, at Treetops Holiday Camp, Farley Green, Nr. Guildford, Surrey. The charges are quite modest, and a programme has been arranged of 2 lectures and discussions. In addition there will be a social evening on Saturday. Meals are provided, i.e., tea and supper Saturday, breakfast, lunch and tea Sunday.

Those members and sympathisers who wish to attend must reserve places in advance, and all bookings must be pre-paid. Reservations should be made direct to the Central Organiser, and money should be sent to E. Lake, 52 Clapham High Street, S.W.4. The inclusive charge is 22/6.

CENTRAL ORGANISER.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.

OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 4th and 18th July, 7.30, at address of R. Lee, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

OUR DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

It is our practice to publish the Declaration of Principles in each issue of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. Its omission from our June issue was an oversight.

IMPORTANT TO ALL LONDON MEMBERS
MID-DAY MEETINGS

We can resume the meetings at Lincoln's Inn Fields provided that those members who are free can keep the pitch free from parking cars. The period a Comrade should attend is 10.15 a.m. till 12 noon. A number of speakers are prepared to speak provided they can be sure of the speaking pitch.

This station is well worth maintaining, so members PLEASE HELP ASSIST THE PARTY in continuing to maintain this excellent propaganda station.

Propaganda Committee.

ISLINGTON LECTURE

Thursday, 26th July at 8.30 p.m.

at

CO-OP HALL, 129, Seven Sisters Road

"History of the Working Class"

V. PHILLIPS

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months (6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Bulls Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. (3th and 19th July). No meetings in August.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reeve Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane Boxley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lee.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (July 11th and 25th) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 2nd, 16th and 30th July, at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to J. Flower, 33, Kenninghall Road, Hackney, E.5.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (4th and 18th July) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 3rd, 17th and 31st July, George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.: Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

PALMERS GREEN Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisle, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, E. Field, 18, Woodlands Park Road, N.15.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- ★ Get subscriptions for the S.S.
Submit names for sample copies.
- ★ Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- ★ Get libraries to display the S.S.
- ★ Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 624 Vol. 52 August, 1956

Sir Anthony Eden's Prophetic Words

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM !

CHINESE HACK STALIN

NATIONALISM, THE ENEMY OF SOCIALISM

THE CRACKSMEN'S LOT AND THE SAFE MAKERS

"TWENTIETH CENTURY SOCIALISM"

AUSTRALIA TAKES GUARD

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

^D
4

ALMOST DAILY WE ARE URGED to worship at the shrine of "progress"; progress in science and its application to industry and of the promise it holds out for the betterment of mankind. We hear of the marvels of atomic power, of radar and radio, of computing machines, of belt systems and automation. With all this "progress" how is it that insecurity and poverty cannot be banished from our lives? After two devastating world wars, numerous lesser wars and half a century of gigantic scientific development Sir Anthony Eden, the Prime Minister, tells us now:

"We are in mortal peril, not of immediate unemployment, but of poverty by stages.

"Inflation is the new battle of Britain. We are all in it, and upon its outcome our homes, our jobs, and our children's future depends."

(*Sunday Express*, 14/7/56).

There are multitudes of hands to produce and plenty of material to work upon but the system is running down because of an alleged flaw in the monetary arrangements. Could anything be more crazy? Robinson Crusoe had no money but he could feed and house himself. Our forefathers fed, housed themselves, and carried their social systems on centuries before money came into existence. People in all past ages have lived in comfort, meeting their needs, without the intervention of money and the worry about inflation. What is the real cause of the trouble; why is inflation only a bugbear of modern times?

Our early forefathers carried on production for the sole purpose of meeting their needs. Now the situation is entirely different. Production is not carried on for the purpose of meeting people's needs. The aim of production is to so arrange it that a profit is made in order that shareholders and bondholders may draw their dividends without needing to work. Hence the Haves and the Have-nots—the workers and the Capitalists—those who must sell their physical and mental energies in order to get the wherewithal to meet their needs and those who can meet their needs without having to sell their energies.

Production today is for the market, and conditions in the market determine how, when, where and if a portion or all of the product will be sold. Conditions in the market can bring prosperity, financial difficulty, or even ruin to many producing concerns as crises of the past have borne witness. If one type of goods is produced too much in excess of what the market can absorb the competition to find buyers leaves some losers in the struggle, which appears to be what is happening in some industries to-day, like the motor industry. If the unsold surplus is large, or if there is an anticipation that this is going to happen, then there is a

cut in production and workers are discharged. The strange part of it is that there can be a large unsold surplus of the very things that the mass of people are sorely in need of but cannot buy because of their limited resources. With only their wages or salaries to depend upon the workers are always on the side that loses when these troubles come.

Inflation is not the cause of poverty, though governments precipitate trouble by debasing the currency and issuing insufficiently backed currency notes in the vain hope of getting out of financial difficulty—or just through plain ignorance.

Money is the medium of market dealings and products must be turned into money before profit, the object of market dealings, can be realised. Thus there is no

way out of the crazy dilemma whilst buying and selling continues to be the means of transferring the product to the consumer. Whilst the means of production are privately owned by an individual, a company, or a State concern buying and selling will still go on. The answer, then, is to abolish this private ownership and substitute for it the common ownership of the means of production and distribution. When this is done human needs and not profit will be the aim of production and money, and all the evils associated with it, will disappear.

Relieve Sir Anthony of the worry of inflation by establishing Socialism. You can do so if you want to. If you heed Sir Anthony's warning about your children you will make haste to join in the battle for Socialism, for it alone will guarantee comfort and security to your children.

GILMAC.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

From Wythenshawe, near Manchester, comes news of more good work by one of our comrades. In the recent sales drive for May he played his full part and disposed of over 300 copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD. But as far as he is concerned, this is only a step in the right direction and does not intend to rest on his laurels. He has already exceeded his May record and is now introducing our pamphlets to his "customers" with good results.

In a recent letter to the secretary of the Ealing Branch, he tells of his assaults on the "better class" areas around Manchester and the gains made. These are not his favourite haunts, however—the front gardens are too long and (some of) the dogs too fierce (cost to date—one pair of trousers).

This news makes excellent reading at a time when one hears far too often the monotonous story of political stagnation all round. All power to his elbow. Just one small point of correction, though. "Wythenshawe is the area for propaganda," he says. Quite correct, comrade, but so is any and every area where Socialists are, and propaganda efforts of one sort or another must go on all the time.

June sales by this energetic comrade number 600!

Camberwell Branch has been so busy that they did not have an opportunity to sum up the special efforts made in May sales of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, until it was too too late for press in the July issue. However, since the branch's part in the sales drive was so successful the following report is of interest. As may be remembered, the branch aimed at a sale of 22 dozen STANDARDS, which was double the usual monthly quota. During May, four members made a total of 14 canvasses. These took place in blocks of flats covering the Kennington Oval and Tulse Hill, Brixton Estates. The whole area had been visited with free back-numbers previously and 43 dozen May STANDARDS were sold. The branch is more than pleased with the general response of workers, and strongly recommends this form of Party activity. The figure quoted above includes sales at meetings but certainly the result far exceeds anything the Branch had hoped for.

Ealing Branch filled a couple of cars for a propaganda trip to Southsea on Sunday, July 15th. A useful meeting was held, which carried on well past the usual



closing time, with interested questions coming along. Literature sales—which incidentally the branch are finding generally higher this year, were encouraging. On 22nd July Kingston Branch went down and went one better than Ealing with two meetings—one in the afternoon and one in the evening. Other branches may well find it worthwhile to visit this spot and combine a day's outing with putting over some Socialist views.

Other Ealing Branch meetings—at Ealing Green on Saturdays at 3.30 p.m. and Heron Court, Richmond, at 8 p.m. on Mondays—have started well. More support from members is needed to help the branch's efforts along.

P.H.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day	1/- (Post free 1/3)
The Socialist Party and War	1/- (" " 1/3)
Russia Since 1917	1/- (" " 1/3)
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years	1/- (" " 1/3)
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis	1/- (" " 1/3)
Socialism	4d. (" " 6d.)
Socialism or Federal Union ?	4d. (" " 6d.)
The Socialist Party : Its Principles and Policy	4d. (" " 6d.)
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism ?	4d. (" " 6d.)
Nationalisation or Socialism ?	6d. (" " 8d.)

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

NATIONALISM, THE ENEMY OF SOCIALISM

SOCIALISTS have a simple solution for the problems of nationalism. It is that all people shall be enabled to live happily wherever they are or wherever they want to go. It is the only solution and it can only be applied when the world has become a Socialist world. It cannot be applied in a Capitalist world though all the non-Socialists, including the Labour and Communist parties, claim that they have a solution that can be applied now. They pay lip-service to various forms of the principle of "self-determination," the principle that nationalist groups should be free to decide for themselves. It sounds fine but it cannot solve the problem even though, if the group is powerful enough with or without military aid from outside, it may succeed in breaking away and setting up its own government or joining another country. It cannot solve the problem because the material on which Nationalism feeds—differences of colour, religion, language and tradition—exist everywhere in every country and because the economic conflicts which capitalism constantly produces at home and internationally will always inflame this material; as fast as one conflagration is put out others spring up. And the economic conflicts taking on the nationalist disguise, with its fever and hatreds, go on between independent nations just as much as when a national group is struggling against alien rule.

Capitalism is a competitive world in which national groups survive by armed force. No government, whatever its professed principles, will voluntarily see its armed strength undermined by granting the right of secession to all who demand it. The Northern States of U.S.A. fought a bloody civil war to prevent the Southern States from seceding in the eighteen sixties; and the nominal right of secession embodied in the Russian Constitution is not worth the paper it is written on unless circumstances arise in which the would-be secessionists can make their demand effective with force. British capitalism gave up India because it lacked the means to hold it, but now Nehru's government acts in accordance with exactly the same "what we have we hold" principle as he denounced during the struggles against the British Government. On May 4, Mr. Nehru announced in the Indian Parliament that "Indian forces attempting to put down the revolt of Naga tribesmen in the hill area of North-Eastern Assam have killed more than 100 rebels and wounded many more since mid-April." (*Manchester Guardian*, 5 May, 1956). The *Manchester Guardian* later, on (21 June), described the Naga demand for independence as "absurd," but then of course all such demands appear absurd to the government resisting them. And when Mr. Nehru informed rioting crowds in Bombay that whether they like it or not they are going to be governed from Delhi for the next five years his words might have come from the lips of Sir John Harding in Cyprus. He told them that Bombay "could not be allowed to decide its own future in its present disturbed mood" (*Daily Mail*, 4 June, 1956). The *Scottish Forward* (14 July) quotes him as saying that because of their recent behaviour the citizens of Bombay have "disqualified themselves from deciding their own future." This report adds the following description, distinctly reminiscent of the old campaign against British rule:—

"As Mr. Nehru was saying this to 200,000 Bombay citizens at a seashore meeting, parts of his public address

were obscured by the whine of tear-gas shells, the sporadic rattle of musketry, the tinkle of broken glass from nearby street lamps, and the slogans of an angry, stone-slinging citizenry."

Everywhere the countries that have won their "freedom" show conflict with their own opposition group, the Karens in Burma, the negroes in U.S.A. and South Africa, the Israelites and Arabs in the Middle East, the Somalis in Ethiopia, the Southern Sudanese in the Sudan, the Tamils in Ceylon; not to mention the Nationalist movements in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. And already the short-time and unemployment in the Midlands have inspired a newspaper to publish an article asking that further immigration of Jamaicans and Irishmen be stopped. (*Sunday Graphic*, 15 July, 1956).

As all these examples show, the word "self-determination" is a misnomer, for none of the nationalist movements accepts that individuals shall be free to choose. Cyprus is a case in point. British capitalism holds it—for strategic reasons; Greek capitalism wants it—for strategic reasons; and the Turkish Government says that if the British leave they will take it—for strategic reasons. But the Greeks and Turks both add a plea based on "self-determination," the Greeks on the ground that the majority of inhabitants are Greek-speaking and the Turks on the ground that the minority are Turkish and are strongly opposed to being ruled by Greece. And the best known of the Cypriot independence movements, E.O.K.A., makes no pretence of letting Greek-speaking Cypriots individually voice their preference for remaining as they are, or becoming independent or joining Greece. Many of their victims are Cypriot-Greeks and a leaflet issued by E.O.K.A. justifies these shootings with the same kind of argument as is used by all governments and all nationalist movements:—

"Some people seem to think that killing people within hospitals is unmanly and immoral. We point out that our holy struggle overrides all such thoughts. Those who are not with us are against us. Those who forget their patriotism will be punished."

(*Manchester Guardian*, 20th April, 1956).

Nationalism and the struggle "for the bloody rags called flags of civilised savages," is not a holy struggle but an exhibition of human ignorance utterly without justification for the workers in the modern world. In the primitive society of past ages patriotism or tribal solidarity was a necessity of survival. In a future, socialist world, freed from the exploitation of man by man, there will be no economic conflicts to masquerade under and take advantage of language, colour and other differences. In the present class-divided and frontier-divided Capitalist world nationalist frictions will continue to serve ruling class ends until they are overcome by the growth of Socialist understanding and Socialist international unity.

H.

Correction

In the letter published in the April issue under the title "What holds us back?" the word "social" was used instead of "socialist" on page 54, col. 1, first paragraph, line 11. In the same column, second paragraph, line 5, "freight business" should be "fruit business."

Ed. COMM.

NOTES BY THE WAY

The New Lie About Stalin's Dictatorship

Now that the Communists are denouncing Stalin's dictatorship they are putting forward the pretence that his dictatorship was a departure from the principles of Lenin and the Russian Communist Party.

The following declarations made by Lenin and Zinoviev in 1920, give this the lie direct.

"Now we are repeating what was approved by the Central Executive Committee two years ago in an official resolution! Now we are drawn back to a question that was decided long ago, in a manner approved of and made clear by the Central Executive Committee—namely, that the Soviet Socialist Democracy is in no way inconsistent with the rule and dictatorship of one person; that the will of a class is at times best realised by a dictator, who sometimes will accomplish more by himself and is frequently more needed. At any rate, the principle towards one person rule was not only explained a long time ago, but was also decided by the Central Executive Committee." (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, page 89, first Russian Edition).

"Every conscious worker must understand that the dictatorship of the working class cannot be realised otherwise than by means of the dictatorship of its advanced guard—the Communist Party."

G. Zinoviev in the *Communist International*, June-July, 1920.

How the Other Dockers Live

The £24 million Birmingham Small Arms group, manufacturers of motor cars, cycles, small arms and machine tools, has been in the news through the dismissal of Sir Bernard Docker from his position as Chairman and Managing Director and his replacement by Mr. John Sangster. Quite a number of interesting things have come out.

First Sir Bernard Docker declared how small is the ownership of most of the shareholders:—

"There are 17,000 shareholders in the B.S.A. group. Apart from half-a-dozen or so big names, the average holding amounts to only a few hundred pounds." (*Evening Standard*, 1st June, 1956).

Then the report of an income tax case brought out how much one of the "big names" owns, Mr. John Sangster, the new Chairman of B.S.A. The following are extracts from the report in the *Daily Mail* (4 July, 1956):

"Mr. John Sangster, 60-year-old millionaire of the B.S.A. group, paid a cheque for £2,000,000 into his deposit account with a Birmingham bank. It caused him considerable trouble."

(The "trouble" was about the correct amount of tax payable on the interest, not simply the trouble of owning £2,000,000.)

The *Daily Mail* explains how he came to have a cheque of this not inconsiderable amount.

"In 1951 he sold his Triumph motor-cycle company to B.S.A. for £2,400,000. He said then: 'The threat of death duties forced me to sell.'"

Then we learned interesting tit-bits about Sir Bernard, from Mr. Sangster and about B.S.A. from Sir Bernard.

It appears from the statement issued by B.S.A. that "in one year Sir Bernard received over £44,000 in fees and expenses. Five special Daimlers he ordered cost the company £50,000. He spent over £2,000 attending the Grace Kelly wedding in Monaco."

(*Daily Mail*, 17 July, 1956.)

Lady Docker also had some entertaining things to say about her ostentatious ways of living. Her

main argument was that it was all good business for the B.S.A.'s Daimler car company. But she also claimed that she did it to please the workers. A *Daily Telegraph* reporter, who interviewed her, talked about her expensive clothes:—

"Another dress, of rose, fully embroidered, was stated to have cost £580, Lady Docker said she wore at a company dance. 'I always like to look glamorous for the workers and everybody there. They expect me to. I always dress up, even when I walk round the factories.'" (*Daily Telegraph*, 13th July, 1956).

To the attacks on him and his wife Sir Bernard retorted by accusing the B.S.A. bosses of extravagance. He mentioned the £12,500 Glandyl Castle, bought by the



company to hold records and management meetings, on which "something like £30,000 must have been spent" on furnishing. (*Daily Express*, 18 July, 1956). This latter expenditure was made without his knowledge and he did not approve.

With all this tossing about of large sums of money the workers were not entirely forgotten for in October last Sir Bernard announced that at "high cost to the company" the hourly-paid workers of B.S.A. were being offered the chance of entering Pension and Life Assurance scheme, on a contributory basis. (*Economist*, 10/10/55). Of course they would not be able to provide for their retirement on quite the same scale as Sir Bernard or Mr. Sangster.

The *Daily Herald Editorial* (19 July, 1956), joyfully welcomed all the rumpus and disclosures about B.S.A., ending, "Tell us more, tell us more, tell us more!"

Certainly we shall tell the *Herald* more. All of this sort of thing goes on in what the *Herald* calls the "Welfare State" and it was in full swing when the Labour Government was in office for six years.

Great Ike and Great Anthony

The Communist *Daily Worker* often says nasty things about Eisenhower and Sir Anthony Eden. It had better

look out or it may find itself out of step with its new heroes Krushchev and Bulganin, for at a dinner in Moscow on 24 June, 1956, these two were toasting Eisenhower and Eden in more than glowing terms. The following is from the Moscow report in the *Daily Mail* (25 June, 1956):

"Another incident of an amazing night was Marshal Bulganin's toast to Sir Anthony Eden: 'Along with such a great man as President Eisenhower, to whose recovery my friend Krushchev proposed a toast, I propose a toast to

another great man—our friend Eden.'"

The *Daily Worker* (25 June) carried a report of the same dinner but not the toast to the great pair. Their reporter did, however, record Bulganin as saying that Eden is "an honest, straightforward person, our friend."

If the great, honest, straightforward Eden is a friend of Bulganin should not the *Daily Worker* be his friend too?

H.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," August, 1906)

Are We Justified?

Ever since its formation it has been urged against the S.P.G.B. that its attitude towards reforms or palliatives was not wise. It is contended by many that the best policy consists in agitating for this or that reform with a view to assisting the workers to get *something now*.

The L.R.C. (now the Labour Party) at their Conference held in Liverpool in January, 1905, carried with acclamation a resolution stating that their *ultimate object* is the socialisation of the means of production, distribution, etc. Neither in the speeches, writings, or actions, of its advocates, however, can much trace of this ultimate object be found, the immediate object apparently taking up the whole of their time and energy.

Whether the immediate complaint that the worker is suffering from too long hours, insufficient food, sweated conditions, or any other of the evils inherent in capitalism, the S.P.G.B. has always maintained that nothing short of Socialism could possibly effect a cure, and has consequently steadfastly refused to be drawn into any reform agitation whatsoever urging that the quickest way to get "something now" even, is to organise to obtain the whole.

To those who pooh-pooh this view; to those who call us impossibilists for holding it; to those who imagine

that they are practical politicians while we are in the clouds; to all these the following extract from Lord Avebury's speech on the burden of armaments made in the House of Lords on the 25th of May is offered for consideration:

"The unrest in Europe, the spread of Socialism . . . was a warning to the governments and the governing classes that the condition of the working class in Europe was becoming intolerable, and that if revolution were to be avoided some step must be taken to increase wages, reduce the hours of labour, and lower the prices of the necessities of life."

Let the workers of the world organise for Socialism and refuse to be drawn from the straight path. They may rely upon it that the more determination they evince to follow this course the more frequently will speeches like the extract given be heard preceding the reforms that will be thrown to them, in order that Lord Avebury and Co. may secure a little longer time in which to enjoy the good things of life, and in order that the day when the working class shall come by its own may be postponed. "Something now" will be obtained, not by agitating for reform, but by organising for revolution, a work which, in this country, the Socialist Party of Great Britain alone is performing.

CHINESE HACK STALIN

THE "Communist" ruling clique in China can scarcely conceal their jubilation over the volte-face in Russian policy since the recent Congress of the Soviet Communist Party touched off the new Party line of vilifying Stalin. But the Chinese go further in attacks on Stalin than Moscow—the beating of Stalin with proverbial scorpions started in an attack in an article on April 4th, that is, considerably before Krushchev's much publicised speech on Stalin's misdeeds, published in *The People's Daily* (the equivalent in China of the *Times* in this Country). The Russian attacks until that time had been confined to the period covering the last years of Stalin's life, but the Chinese went back as far as the late 1920's during the Civil War in China between the Communist Party and the Nationalists and show that by the Chinese Communist Party following Stalin's dictates "the result was that instead of isolating the real enemy we isolated ourselves and inflicted blows on ourselves which benefited the real enemy." The Chinese level a variety of charges against Stalin including one that "Stalin failed to draw the lessons from particular, local and temporary mistakes on certain issues and so failed to prevent them from be-

coming serious errors involving the whole nation over a long period of time!" The Russian ruling-class, for whom Stalin was for many years the chief spokesman, have in fact piled up quite an imposing lot of treacheries against their Chinese "Communist" comrades. Firstly, there was Stalin's instructions to the Chinese Communist Party to co-operate with the Nationalists. The Nationalists, emboldened by this policy, suddenly turned on the Communists and butchered them in their thousands. Stalin abandoned them.

Chou-en lai, the present Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, was one of the Communist leaders in Shanghai who by a remarkable chance escaped. Mao-tse tung and the rest of those elsewhere who escaped are not likely to forget this formerly unpaid debt to Stalin that they now have a chance to work off. Secondly, during the blockade of the Chinese Communists by the Nationalists it was the Soviet advisers under the control of Stalin who advocated the disastrous policy of static warfare. It was when this policy was abandoned that the Chinese Communist Armies became more mobile and became more successful. But this was learning the hard way and meanwhile Chinese

Communists were driven by the Soviet advisers like pigs to the slaughter.

But there was also the question of Stalin's disastrous theory to overcome. Stalin considered peasants as being merely the "packhorses of civilisation" and that no revolutionary party could be built on them. The advice therefore to the Chinese was to capture the cities and thus to get the city proletariat into the revolt—no workers, no Communism. That was the Russian dogma—but it was in the cities that the Nationalists were the strongest and the Communists were not able to hold a single large city, being repulsed with tremendous losses.

At the conclusion of the second world war when the Japanese capitulated to Russia their arms and ammunition and their control of Manchuria and China were handed over by Stalin not to the Communists who had borne the brunt of the Chinese war against the Japanese but to their mortal enemies the Nationalists. Thus was the Chinese civil war again precipitated, plunging the population into all the horrors that a civil war can cause.

The Chinese Communists could not be expected to miss a chance to vent their spleen on Stalin—their pet aversion—and all this is thoroughly understood by those in power in Russia at the moment. Mao Tse Tung was the only leader of the Soviet bloc countries who did not go to Moscow for Stalin's funeral.

The latest developments in the Soviet Union cannot be understood properly if one fails to see them in the perspective of Soviet relations with other countries, and Soviet/Chinese relations occupy, in this respect, a position of special importance. Foreign policies of capitalist countries are intimately linked with their need for foreign trade. Industrial enterprises usually are concerned with development of their production. Sometimes the effect of many concerns all expanding as best they can produces an overall picture of haphazard development whereby the existing markets can no longer absorb the products produced and it becomes imperative to expand these markets and enter new ones. This is where foreign policy can be useful such as in opening the way for trade by friendly relations and by concluding trade treaties. The State Capitalist economy of Russia is no exception to all this.

Since Stalin's death Russia has been desperately trying to develop economic and diplomatic relations with any country who might reciprocate. Stalin died in March, 1953, leaving not only a legacy of strained Soviet/Chinese relations, but a rival figure in world Communism—Mao Tse-tung—the head of a State with a population of 500 million. Mao Tse-tung was the leader of an Asian Communist Party who had achieved victory in an Asian country moreover not with Russian advice but against it. Furthermore, many of the countries of S. E. Asia have a sizeable Chinese minority who because of their position of dominance in various trades and industry wield a power out of proportion to their numbers. These Chinese look to Mao Tse-tung and China for inspiration and backing. Stalin is no more: Russia is a long way away. But China is closer, and anyway has three times the man-power of Russia which sees influence passing to the Chinese.

The Chinese were quick to press their advantage. Chou En-lai visited India and Burma, where he signed with Nehru and U Nu the five principles of co-existence. His participation in the Bandung Conference, together with visits of other Chinese leading personalities, has

enhanced Peking's prestige in Asia.

Long before they visited this country, Bulganin and Krushchev in October, 1954, went to Peking. At the close of the visit a communique was issued containing a number of political and economic concessions by the Soviet Union to China. Since then Russian policy has been to make further concessions to China. They also went on a barnstorming tour of other Asian countries and outdid the Chinese by offering economic concessions to successfully expand Russian trade.

The violent attacks on Stalin by the Chinese Communists should not be ascribed to personal bitterness. Were this the case, then surely these attacks would have been made at the times when Stalin perpetrated those foul actions and personal feelings were running high. Presumably it was not advisable in the interests of the budding capitalism of China to bring these points up before. There is little emotion entering into the apparent friendships between Capitalist groups either within the "Communist" bloc or the "Democratic" group. "Friendship" is merely an expression of foreign policy which is liable to change to suit altered conditions. Capitalist friendship frequently conceals throat-cutting, their advice may be pitted with treachery (as the Chinese Communist found out to their cost), co-operation may camouflage competition and co-existence conceal moves to "liberate" and exploit weaker groups.

The attacks on Stalin by the Chinese should be considered as the expression of one expanding power to a rival, and, incidentally, as revealing the stresses and contradictions in Capitalist relations of the type that this system of society continually throws up.

F. OFFORD.



A Sock in His Master's Voice

THE PASSING SHOW

The Vanguard

The Communist Party proudly boasts that it is "the party of the working-class," "the vanguard of the proletariat." It bases this claim on the fact that when members of the working-class who live in the countries of the Anglo American bloc go on strike or demand higher pay, the Communist Parties of those countries usually give them support. But this is not the real test. The real test is this—what do the Communist Parties do in those countries where they are in power? The answer is, of course, quite clear to anyone who studies the systems obtaining in those countries with an unbiased mind—the Communist Party in power builds up a system of State Capitalism, in which the workers are denied even those elementary democratic freedoms which they have won in those countries where capitalism has been established for a longer time.

Poznan

The Communist Party's claim to be a Socialist Party rests chiefly on the sympathy they appear to extend to the workers in countries where they do not form the government. But if this makes the Communists into supporters of Socialism, it also makes all the other ruling classes in the world into Socialists.

For example, when there are any disturbances or strikes in Communist-dominated countries, the Press in the Western countries immediately leaps to defend the strikers. The authorities in the Communist-dominated country (just like the authorities in any other country, when faced with a similar situation) allege that all the trouble is caused by agitators. But the supporters of the ruling class in the Western world claim that the real reason is the oppression of the working class. After the recent riots in Poznan, the *Sunday Times*—an avowed supporter of capitalism—had this to say (1-7-56):

"For the cause of the riots was primarily economic. They were an outburst of discontent by over-driven, under-fed industrial workers. Suggestions that they were the result of long planning by 'imperialist agents' are discounted by authoritative observers in the West and Poland itself."

Kind Words Cost Nothing

How easy it is for a ruling class, or its supporters, to sympathize with the victims of oppression by a rival ruling class! This kind of sympathy has nothing to do with Socialism, or with the support for the international working-class. It is simply a part of the cold war. The British ruling class weeps crocodile tears for the sufferings of the workers—on the other side of the Iron Curtain; and the Russian ruling class loudly bemoans the fate of the workers—on this side of the barrier. The Communist Parties of the Western World are simply the agents of the Russian ruling class in this propaganda war.

Redundancy

The British Motor Corporation has decided that 6,000 of its workers are redundant, and has sacked them on the spot, giving them a week's pay in lieu of notice. This action seems unnecessarily arbitrary, so much so that even the Conservative Chancellor, Mr. MacMillan, and the Minister of Labour, Mr. MacLeod, have indulged in

some finger-wagging at the B.M.C. The unions feebly say they ought to have been consulted first; as if a man is any less unemployed because discussions have gone on about him before he got the sack. Several factories went on strike as soon as the news spread; and subsequently the leaders of all the unions concerned met and recommended a withdrawal of all labour from the British Motor Corporation from July 23rd.

But what the union leaders appear to have overlooked is that in this kind of situation a strike may play into the hands of the employers. At the present time too many cars are being produced for the economic demand; production is running at too high a level. A strike will reduce production again; it is equivalent to the B.M.C. sacking all its workers for a week or two, or however long the strike lasts, without pay or compensation of any kind. Indeed, the action of the B.M.C. was so abrupt that it raises the question whether the corporation did not intend to precipitate a strike by its employees.

Impasse

But what else can the workers do in this situation. The answer is—Nothing. Under capitalism the workers always get the thick end of the stick. In some circumstances the workers can use the weapon of strike action to defend their standards of living and even to raise them; but when the employers have more labour-power than they can use, it is a bad time for the workers to strike. The only way the workers can bring about a lasting and worthwhile improvement in their conditions is to abolish capitalism and create, in its place, a Socialist society.

"Towards" Equality

From 1945 to 1951 the Labour Party was in power in this country, and it constantly proclaimed that it was pushing through a social revolution. The constant reply of the Socialist Party—which looks not at what men say, but at what they do—was "what revolution?" And now the Labour Party itself seems to have come round to the same point of view. For it has recently issued a new pamphlet "Towards Equality," and in it is contained the remarkable admission that after six years of Labour Government "half Britain's wealth is still owned by one per cent. of the population while half the nation own little more than their personal and household effects" (*Reynolds News*, 8-7-56). This pattern of property-distribution—with the small Capitalist class owning vast amounts of wealth, and the large working class owning hardly anything—is the same as it was in 1945, before the Labour Party came to power, and in 1951, after it had carried through all its reforms. The Labour Party made no change at all in the Capitalist nature of society; it turned various industries over from private to State Capitalism—but Capitalist they remained. Has the Labour Party learned anything from its failure in 1945-51? Judging by the pamphlet, it has not. The old panaceas are trotted out—better pensions, higher family allowances, industrial democracy (whatever that might be in a capitalist society)—they are all there. The Labour Party has nothing better to offer than further doses of the reformist medicine which (as its pamphlet now virtually admits) failed so abysmally last time. (Continued on page 121)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

AUGUST



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM

I had to come and here it is—"People's Capitalism," the description given to the U.S.A. in an advertisement of General Electric (*New Yorker*, June 16, 1956). We have had "peoples' democracies," the name given by Communists to Russia and her East European Satellites—now admitted to be thug-ridden police-states. We have had "people's courts" in the same countries, where framed-up victims of political and personal vendettas "confess" to non-existent crimes. We have been told that this is the century of "the common man," in which the common man is not only exploited, conscripted, intimidated and humiliated—just as he was in the century before—but in which, in addition, he is now expected to take pride in being master of his fate. Oscar Wilde's definition of democracy seems to be particularly appropriate, "bludgeoning of the people by the people, for the people."

The General Electric claims that American Capitalism is quite different from Capitalism anywhere else:—

"Around the world the term 'capitalism' has been applied to economic systems which bear little resemblance to each other. Our American brand of capitalism is distinctive and unusually successful because it is a 'people's capitalism' All the people share in its responsibilities and benefits."

The advertisement goes on to list the ways in which the American brand is supposed to differ from the others—and in almost every particular the list shows the falsity of the claim. Those who run Capitalism in London, Delhi, Moscow, Warsaw, governments in all the continents, all the Powers, big, medium and small, make almost identical claims. Here are the eight principles in which Americans are said to believe:—"We believe in providing opportunities for the individual to develop himself to his maximum potential"; mass production and low prices; high wages, high productivity and high purchasing power; "we in America believe in innovation and

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD August, 1956

in scrapping the obsolete"; instalment buying; shorter hours and more leisure; "broad share ownership of American business . . . and almost everyone indirectly owns shares through insurance policies, savings banks, pension plans, mutual funds, bank accounts and other investments"; "and finally, we in America believe deeply in competition versus the cartel."

So little does Capitalism in the different countries differ from the above eight-point declaration that an all-in conference of Governments in United Nations would probably vote unanimously for a resolution embodying them—and then each Minister would go home to preserve the realities of Capitalism, poverty for the mass, and wealth and privilege for the few. Capitalism takes on many masks and disguises, and ingenious party vote-catchers have invented innumerable names and slogans to make capitalism acceptable to its victims, but everywhere its economic features (production for sale and profit, the system of wage-labour, and capital investment in company shares and government bonds) sufficiently conform to a common pattern amply to justify the common destination capitalism.

Yes, Indeed

IN a television programme called *Points of View* on June 1st, 1956, Sir Beverley Baxter spoke fervently in favour of minorities as such.

"Remember it is from the minorities that your leadership comes," he said. And again: "In every civilization there is an old saying—look to your minorities."

It is gratifying to hear such words—even though they are silly—from Sir Beverley. Perhaps in his next television appearance he will reconcile them with his contemptuous behaviour towards the S.P.G.B., which ranges from failing to turn up for a public debate to misrepresenting us in a newspaper and being thoroughly rude when he was asked about it.

BOOM-TIME

UNDER the conditions of accumulation supposed thus far, which conditions are those most favourable to the labourers, their relation of dependence upon capital takes on a form enduring, or as Eden says, "easy and liberal." Instead of becoming more intensive with the growth of capital, this relation of dependence only becomes more extensive, i.e., the sphere of Capital's Exploitation and rule merely extends with its own dimensions and the number of its subjects.

A larger part of their own surplus-product, always increasing and continually transformed into additional capital, comes back to them in the shape of means of payment, so that they can extend the circle of their enjoyments, can make some addition to their consumption fund of clothes, furniture, etc., and can lay by small reserve funds of money.

But just as little as better-clothing, food, and treatment and a larger peculium (Peculium: pocket-money given to slave by master), do away with the exploitation of the slaves, so little do they set aside that of the wage-worker.

A rise in the price of labour, as a consequence of accumulation of capital, only means, in fact, that the length and weight of the golden chain the wage-worker has already forged for himself, allow of a relaxation of the tension of it. (Karl Marx, "Capital," Vol. 1, page 676. Kerr edition, 1921).

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD August, 1956

PASSING SHOW—continued from page 119

Touching Tale

From the *Evening Standard*, 21-6-56:

"The 71-year-old Duchess of Leinster has been telling my reporter why she has settled in Jersey, where income tax is 4s. in the pound and where there are no death duties. It is, she said, 'a mother's duty.'"

"Living here is my only chance of helping my children," added the Duchess. "If you have got any feelings for your family, you will do everything possible to safeguard their future."

The older members of the working class who are now surviving (living is too strong a word) on the Old Age Pension, and who would be profoundly thankful to have an income on which it was possible to pay income tax, may be interested to hear about the Duchess. It is clear that this kind of parental affection is confined to members of the upper class. You never hear of aged workers

retiring to Jersey on the grounds that red wine is 3s. 6d. a litre, expensive cars cost £700 less than in London, and petrol is a third cheaper—further reasons given by the Duchess for her move. But though driven from her homeland by excessive taxation, the Duchess is still one jump ahead of the workhouse. Her son-in-law and daughter (the Duke and Duchess of Bedford, as readers will know), bought the 24-roomed farmhouse where she is living for £18,000, and are spending £10,000 on renovations.

"In a fortnight's time the Duchess is going away on a 10-week caravan holiday on the Continent. The 18-foot caravan has been built to her design. Her chef and his wife will be going, too."

Which forms a pleasant contrast to the charity Day's Outing to Southend, which is the corresponding treat enjoyed by aging members of the useful class in society.

ALWYN EDGAR.

THE CRACKSMEN'S LOT—AND THE SAFE-MAKERS

CAPITALIST prosperity has been very good for the safe-makers. Well-filled order books are reported by all the big manufacturers, and exports have increased considerably. Not a re-assuring piece of news for the burglar, of course, though apparently he's doing his best to cope, improving his efficiency and competitiveness in the true capitalist spirit. As an interesting little article in the *Financial Times* stated the other day (18th July):—

"The essential problem for the heavy safe maker is to keep at least one step ahead of the burglar. The number of attacks on safes and strongrooms may not have increased in recent years, but the methods of the burglar have kept pace with scientific advance."

"The safe cracksman to-day may well employ as standard equipment the oxy-acetylene blowpipe, electric drills and explosives."

Really trying hard to move with the times, one must agree. And, naturally, the safe-makers must do the same.

"The best of modern safes are designed to be resistant against any foreseeable kind of attack. Thus the walls are constructed of several types of different steels, each with its own particular resistant property. Some of these special steels have proved totally impenetrable to the blowpipe."

"Explosive is a common method of attack to-day, especially as a means of shattering the locks. Anti-explosive devices are now provided so that even if the lock is completely destroyed the door will remain firmly closed."

At the same time, of course, the safe manufacturers must make a lot of security arrangements on their own account. It would never do, for example, to leave a lot of duplicate safe numbers lying about.

"Safe makers are very careful about their own security arrangements. They keep no copies of keys or records, while at their works the safes are known by number only and the customer is never disclosed."

"The choice between combination or key lock is a matter for the customer's preference. The idea that the burglar can hear a combination lock fall into place is claimed by the makers to be a complete fallacy, however. A four tumbler combination may have 100m. different combinations. The cracksman reduces these odds by trying first obvious numbers, such as dates of birthdays in the owner's family."

What with a 100 million different combinations to choose from, steel doors to blow open, no possibility of



hearing the tumblers falling into place, plus other such hazards as the local policeman seeing a light or hearing the bang, the cracksman doesn't seem to have much of a chance. But the manufacturers apparently aren't so sure.

So unsure are they that they have set themselves a standard of workmanship and reliability. What it is, you'll never guess.

"The standard which is normally worked to is that the safe or strong-room should resist attack by known methods for a period of four days—the length of the longest bank holiday."

Henceforth, our Easters and Christmases are going to have added sorrow—the thought of safe-manufacturers lying awake at nights wondering whether their standard is going to last the week end. One thing's a necessity under capitalism—a sense of humour!

S. H.

PARLIAMENT, LEADERS AND NATIONALISATION

A Reader's Objections Answered

Greenford, Middx.
19/6/56.

Dear Sir,

I have read your literature very carefully and heartily agree with most of the ideas expressed therein but feel that I cannot join your party.

Briefly my reasons are as follows:

1. You appear to scorn Parliamentary Representation, which to me seems essential at least for the present. Weak and "Wishy-Washy" as the Labour Party is, it does at least present some opposition to the ruling body, and show them that everyone does not agree with their idea of running the country.

2. Unless I have misread your books it seems you do not believe in "Leaders." Surely there must be someone in each phase of the country's activities, capable of stepping into vacated posts and directing affairs.

3. The comparative failure of Nationalisation was, I think, due to the fact that they were still directed by the old bosses, simply because the Labour Party had no one ready or capable of doing the job resulting in at least partial sabotage at the top.

Yours sincerely,
B. S. ANDERSON.

REPLY

1. Political Action

Our correspondent has not at all understood our position. Political action is an absolute necessity to achieve Socialism. This requires that Socialists shall send their delegates to Parliament and the local councils for the purpose of achieving Socialism. It does not mean that Parliament can impose Socialism on a non-Socialist electorate, or induce a non-Socialist electorate to accept the Socialism that they do not want or understand. The S.P.G.B. has no members in Parliament only because there are too few Socialists to send them there. In the post-war elections at which the S.P.G.B. put up candidates they were at the bottom of the poll because the overwhelming majority of electors, not being Socialists, wanted Tory or Labour or Liberal or Communist administered capitalism and did not want Socialism.

If our correspondent attaches value to the government of the day being opposed by the Opposition of the day he cannot fail to get it under the parliamentary system of this country. When the Tories are in the Labour Opposition try to dispute with them the way they run capitalism and when Labour is in the Tories will do the same for them. But this is not what Socialists want. We are opposed to capitalism and strive all the time to get the workers to see that minor differences in the way capitalism is administered are not their concern.

Our correspondent is quite wrong in thinking that we oppose the Labour Party because it is "weak and wishy-washy." We oppose it because it is not Socialist, and we question the opinion that its running of capitalism could be described as weak and wishy-washy. Its support for British capitalism in the second world war (in Churchill's government), its imposition of conscription after 1945, its use of troops in strikes, its great re-armament programme and waging of the war in Korea, its preaching of wage-restraint and "work harder," its drive

to capture foreign markets, etc., these activities were as forcible as anything the Tories could have wanted even though they questioned the wisdom, from a Capitalist standpoint, of the Labour programme of State Capitalism (nationalisation.)

2. The Need for Leaders

It is quite correct that the Socialist does not support leadership. The essence of leadership is the implication that the workers can safely entrust their affairs, including their position under capitalism and the achievement of Socialism, to elected or self-appointed individuals who will in their wisdom decide what to do and how to do it. The assumed justification for leadership is that the rank and file do not properly understand what are the problems and how they should be tackled. This is indeed true and will remain so until the workers become Socialists and understand that their urgent need is Socialism. Then they will know exactly what to do and will instruct their delegates accordingly. In the meantime the mass of the workers do not understand; but what of the Labour Leaders? What do they know of Capitalism or Socialism? And what difference would it make if they did have knowledge, since their continuance as leaders would depend upon suiting the lack of knowledge of their own followers? Since 1924 (year of the first Labour Government) the Labour leaders have held office in four administrations, each marked with crises, wars, and unemployment, and followed by lost elections and disillusionment for those who trusted them. This is what is bound to come of leaders running capitalism. And what about Socialism? Earl Attlee's pathetic admission after his party's defeat in 1955 was that "we are nowhere near the kind of society we want. We have an infinitely long way to go." (*Manchester Guardian*, 6/6/55).

The workers have so far always trusted in leaders, ranging from the Attlee type down to megalomaniac Stalin. It has brought them lots of wars and other evils but no Socialism; only the continuance of capitalism.

3. Nationalisation

Our correspondent refers to the "comparative failure" of Nationalisation and attributes it to the wrong sort of men at the top, men who partly sabotaged it.

The use of the term "comparative failure" implies that nationalisation has been partly a failure and partly a success. Unfortunately our correspondent does not specify what it is that nationalisation has partly done and partly failed to do. Nationalisation is State Capitalism—it was Attlee who in 1931 (*New Statesman*, 7/11/1931) described our oldest nationalised institution, the Post Office, as "the outstanding example of collective capitalism." Making a success of nationalisation means making a success of State Capitalism. Our correspondent thinks that it could be a success if the right men ran it, but a success for whom? Successful capitalism, whether private or State Capitalism, means efficient production, low costs and high profits, which means efficient exploitation of the workers. The men in control have nothing to do with the Capitalist lines on which nationalised industries have to be run. This was specifically laid down by the Labour Government in each of the Nationalisation Acts it passed in 1945-1951; each one of the Boards was re-

quired by the Act to make profit at least sufficient in amount to cover the continuing annual payment to the former share-owners. They have, therefore, all been bound by law to try to keep wages down to the level that enabled profit to be made. Some of the nationalised industries have done this handsomely, others have run into deficit. In the view of many critics of nationalisation the former have "succeeded" while the latter have "failed."

This may or may not be how our correspondent judges success and failure, but let there be no doubt about the Socialist attitude. Socialists are opposed to capitalism, including nationalisation, no matter who runs it or how. This should not be surprising, for after all we are Socialists and want Socialism.

Ed. COMM.

AUSTRALIA TAKES GUARD

ASURE fire subject of conversation with almost any reticent Englishman in the summer of 1956, is the latest Test match score, and many a City gent. on hearing of another fallen wicket must have locked his office door and with his umbrella shown himself just how he would have put Lindwall away to the boundary.

Yet not all the headlines about an Australian "fight-back" and "aggression" need refer to happenings at Lord's or Old Trafford, for in the pot of international disputes there is something of a trade war brewing up between England and Australia. The director of the Commonwealth Bureau of Agricultural Economics has said in Canberra that Britain's "attitudes, policies and behaviour" are "unfair" and "reprehensible" and among the mumbblings of Australian politics is that of Mr. John McEwen, Minister of Trade, who has recently described his government as "hurt" by Britain's trading policies. Mr. McEwen, with a substantial press backing, is currently peddling a "get tough with Britain" line.

What are the reasons for this tetchiness in Canberra? First, Australia's trade with the U.K. is badly out of balance—in the nine months ended in March of this year she imported goods from Britain worth £A269 million compared to exports in return of only £A181½ million. Then there is the matter of wheat, of which Australia is one of the world's major exporters. The stockpiling scramble of the Korean war caused a vastly increased production of wheat and a consequent fall in its price. The end of the boom left Australia, growing some of the cheapest wheat in the world, with an unsellable surplus and looking sourly on the British policy of supporting home production on the one hand and preferring to buy Argentine wheat on the other.

Another source of irritation is the present state of trading preferences. In the Ottawa agreement of 1932 Britain and Australia agreed to grant entry to each other's imports at a lower duty than they charged on other countries goods. Australia accepted a preference based on fixed duties and the benefits of this have dwindled in our post-war inflation, just as money which was banked in 1932 has by now been devalued. But Britain secured a preference based on a percentage of their exports values and this has enabled her to keep a relative advantage on the Australian market. So a measure which was supposed to promote international friendship has turned out to be a cause of dissension; but there is nothing new in that.

To ease her problems Australia would like the U.K. to restrict imports of cheap wheat (unless, of course, it comes from Australia) and to re-negotiate the Ottawa pact so as to give Australian products new preferences. The difficulty in the way of both these suggestions is Britain's membership of G.A.T.T., whose rules forbid any such moves. Even so, Australia is pressing for a new,

comprehensive Commonwealth trade agreement; this was one of the points raised by Mr. Menzies at the recent London conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers. If Australia cannot gain any concessions here, she may, in return, take steps to end her status as Britain's largest single export market.

Meantime in the past few years Australia has several times drastically reduced its imports, the latest of these restrictions being introduced on July 1st. last. These cuts were designed to prune Australia's imports by about £32 million in a full year. In addition Australia is making a strong bid to capture as much as possible of the U.K.'s trade with New Zealand.

Another reason for the deepening rift between the two countries is the change in the strategic relations of the Pacific since the war's end. Before the sharpening of the Russo-American conflict Australia's military interests extended to the Middle East. Now that Asia is a centre of tension these interests have been forced back to the Pacific, where the gap left by Great Britain's waning power has been largely filled by that of America. Increasingly, Australia is dependent on the United States to keep intact her perilous existence between the great powers on the one hand and an almost indifferent Asia on the other. Whitehall gets hardly a look in.

Now the conclusion which we can draw from all this is that the much-boasted bonds of the British Commonwealth of Nations do not hold against the pressures of Capitalist competition and international conflict. Australia, as a normal Capitalist power, has trading interests which she will defend in any way open to her, even if that should mean offending her partners in the Commonwealth. For example, the recent import cuts came at a particularly bad time for the struggling British car industry but, as *The Economist* has put it, "trade cuts across politics." Even the politics of the supposedly united British Commonwealth and with the government of the traditionally Empire-fostering Tory party bossing it in Whitehall.

Australia's position in the affairs of international trade and conflict was neatly depicted by *Manchester Guardian* cartoonist David Low just after the Foreign Ministers' conference a couple of years ago at Geneva. His sketch showed a path bordering a lake and into the picture from the left ran Anthony Eden, dressed as a nursemaid, dragging behind him a pram full of tattered Union Jacks. As he ran he stretched out an imploring hand to another nannie, scampering off to the right with her pram. This one was identified as United States Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. His pram was labelled "American Sphere of Responsibility" and it held a lot of bonny babies of various Far Eastern nationalities. One of the bounciest, sucking a stick of striped candy, was called "Australia."

IVAN.

DRUGS AND THE DEATH PENALTY

WHILE the controversy about the abolition of hanging has been causing such a furore in this country, a significant change in the American law recently has passed by almost without comment. This is the passing by Congress of the Bill aimed at the drug traffic in the United States, which includes in its provisions increased penalties for trafficking in drugs and, in particular, the death penalty for those found guilty of selling heroin to young people under 18. The background of the Bill, the drug traffic, was recently reported on by a U.S. correspondent of the *Economist* (14th July, 1956). The picture is horrifying.

According to the *Economist's* correspondent the United States is said to have more drug addicts than all the other Western nations combined, and the authorities are engaged in a constant battle against the traffic. The main impetus to it is given by the needs of 60,000 addicts who are prepared to spend anything from \$10 to \$100 a day to satisfy their craving. To get this money, many of them resort to crime, and it has been said that about half of the crimes committed in large cities and about a quarter of crimes in the U.S., are the result of this drive to get drugs.

The police seem to be able to do little more than hold their own. Smuggling is fairly easy, and rife. The product is small and expensive, and profits are huge—nine ounces of uncut heroin can earn \$50,000 when diluted for retail sale. New pedlars soon step in to take the places of those arrested and put in gaol.

Apart from the sale of such vicious drugs as heroin, there is a large business done in other less dangerous drugs, much of it barely legal. In the words of the *Economist*:—

"But the narcotics problem extends beyond the underworld; it reaches on to the counters of unscrupulous chemists. Housewives eager to lose weight take amphetamines and do not realise that they have become addicts until it is too late. Officials are also worried about the widespread use of barbiturates (sleeping pills). In theory these are obtainable only with a physician's prescription; in fact many chemists will sell them and users do not realise that addiction leads to grave dangers to mental health."

Altogether a terrible story. And made even more dreadful by the extension of the death penalty to try to deal with it.

S. H.

"TWENTIETH CENTURY SOCIALISM"

UNDER the title *Twentieth Century Socialism—The Economy of To-morrow* a group calling itself "Socialist Union" have produced a book which is neither about Socialism nor by Socialists. A note inside the cover tells us it is by the group that publishes *Socialist Comment* and that it has the backing of prominent members of the Labour Party.

In the foreword they say:

"Our aim has been to find a comprehensive and consistent view of the Socialist economy of to-morrow, which combines the idealism inherent in our conception of the good society with the realism essential to bring it about."

"We are well aware that what we have to say is not the last word on this subject. But we offer it to our fellow-Socialists as an honest attempt to think out afresh the foundations of a Socialist faith and its implications in the modern world."

There is no fresh thinking in the book. It consists of the old old "Evolutionary Socialism," the little by little and bit by bit, which eventually comes back to support of the Labour Party and its nationalisation policy. But unlike the earlier advocates, who at least claimed to be working towards a system of Common Ownership, these fresh thinkers are working towards a system which they sum up as follows:

"The keynote of Socialist realism has always been its emphasis on a transformation of the economic system. This must remain. What has to be rejected is the idea of transformation through total public ownership; that leads only to totalitarianism. The first part of realism today is to recognise this fact and accept its consequences. A Socialist economy is a mixed economy, part private and part public, and mixed in all its aspects. It comprises private spending as well as public spending, private ownership as well as public ownership, private enterprise as well as public enterprise."

"In practice this is already accepted by the British Labour movement." (Page 146).

All through the book Socialism is envisaged as a

system in which there will be buying and selling, markets conflicting economic interests, and a money-economy, plus leadership and the usual complicated paraphernalia of capitalism. The book had favourable reviews from Capitalist newspapers, and no wonder. In spite of a good deal about equality, freedom and fair shares, the authors rail against too much "State intervention" in a way that must go straight to the hearts of defenders of capitalism. The following quotations are examples of their outlook:

"This means that a Socialist economy is not just a planned economy, but a planned market economy. It is through the markets that individuals exercise their freedom of choice. If workers are to be free to choose whether to work for one employer rather than another, and employers to choose which workers to employ, there must be a labour market. If consumers are to decide whether and on what they want to spend their money, there must be commodity markets in which they can make their choice." (Page 134).

"The principle by which economic power is directed towards Socialist ends may be described as the principle of planning through strategic participation. The state takes over economic power at the key points in the economy—the budget, the key industries, large property concentrations—and uses these as its planning base. How the government uses its planning powers and what it plans for, will always be under public scrutiny, for in a democracy the state itself is controlled by Parliament and all the normal political processes."

"But political processes alone are not a complete safeguard. They are remote from the daily scene of economic operations, and do not always prove effective in detailed application. This is the significance of limiting the government to no more than a partial participation in the economy. As long as an independent sector remains, it can act as a perpetual and very effective check on the state's activities. If there continue to be private employers and independent trade unions, and bargaining between them produces good results, there will be no escaping the insistence of the unions on similar conditions from public

employers. If public enterprise is less efficient than private, if it gives less satisfactory service to the consumer, the comparison will be there for all to see, and public opinion will not acquiesce for long. If private investment meets the nation's needs, there will be no call for public investment. At every point the nature and efficacy of state activity can be directly challenged." (Pages 137, 138).

"These three guiding principles for the control of economic power—the principle of balance of power; the principle of planning through strategic participation, and the principle of social accountability—form an integrated whole. They draw together the threads of our present argument, so that out of the warp of the ends and the weft of the means the pattern of a socialistic economic system can be woven. It is an economy with a private and a public sector, but where all economic power, no matter what its nature or by whom it is held, can be made subject to effective control. This control may be economic, political, or social. Each of these forms may be applied separately or in combination." (Page 140).

"The private sector of a Socialist economy is not there merely on sufferance, to be tolerated only on the grounds of political expediency, with the Sword of Damocles hanging over it in a perpetual threat. On the contrary, it has a legitimate and necessary function to perform. Within the limits of equality there must be opportunities for people to spend as they wish, to own, to initiate and experiment; they must be able to form associations to further their economic interests. In all these areas the individual must have a chance to act without waiting for the approval of the state." (Page 147).

We have quoted considerably from the book to show how empty are the authors' claims to a freshness of outlook, and also because their real outlook is apt to be obscured for the uncritical reader by long and windy dissertations on equality, freedom and fair shares.

The authors take for granted that "full employment" has come to stay and they claim that to-day "the rich are less rich and the poor less poor, and neither has much of a surplus to save out of their incomes" (page 88). As to the position of the rich see the many reports in the papers of the lavish coming out parties (one recently cost £5,000) and the other evidences of lavish spending on the part of the class that owns. But the authors themselves give contrary evidence. They tell us that human needs are taking the place of profit in industry and on page 115 they tell us that "The decline in the influence of the profit motive, even in private industry, has opened the way for change." Yet on other pages they contradict this view. The following are examples of this.

"It is a remarkable comment on our present society that, despite all the progress made in other directions, Aristotle's definition of a slave as a 'living tool' still remains a far too apt description of the working life of the majority of industrial employees." (P. 101).

"There are two main reasons why the distribution

of incomes is so grossly unequal at the source. The first is the great disparities in the ownership of property; a small fraction of the population own so large a portion of the nation's wealth that they are bound to draw large unearned incomes simply because of the size of their holdings. The second is that certain types of property, notably the ownership of business enterprise, yield a high return in the form of distributed profits and capital gains. Not only do the owners of the ordinary shares in these private concerns derive substantial incomes from them, but the profits permit the payment of very high salaries to the leading managerial posts and the granting of extravagant allowances in the form of expense accounts. These two reasons for the persistently heavy income inequalities continually reinforce each other on the principle of 'to him that hath shall be given.' High profits swell the unearned incomes derived from past accumulations of property, and in turn provide the basis on which new accumulations are built."

There are many similar statements which would crowd our columns too much to reproduce. It is the common attempt among "intellectuals" to appear impartial. The "on the one hand, and on the other hand" attitude; on the one hand the Capitalists are getting poorer on the other hand they are getting richer—but all the time they are piling up profits, expanding, and getting richer!

The authors constantly refer to what is "just" and "fair" but their outlook is based on levels of ownership and levels of culture with the managerial representatives of capital in the saddle. To them inequalities of this nature are permanent and they pour scorn on the idea that the mass of the population are capable of rising superior to an outlook that they claim is conditioned by capitalism.

Although the book begins with the contention that "Socialists" have lost sight of the end they set out to accomplish and have become bogged down by means to that end, this is exactly their own position except that they have no inkling of a Socialist end. Instead of being concerned with ends the authors are concerned with making capitalism work smoothly. They suggest ways to handle the complicated mechanism of capitalism that is as complicated and dubious as capitalism and, infuse their ideas with that modern disease, sectoritis.

Looking at the past they identify Socialism with public ownership, and Marxism with Russian State Capitalism. With this erroneous outlook this book is worthless from the Socialist point of view, but it may have some value as a guide to making capitalism palatable to the workers. It seems to the present writer that the object of the book is simply to get the Labour Party back into power to pursue its futile policies.

GILMAC.

THE CRITICS CRITICISED

PROFESSOR POPPER LOOKS AT HISTORY

(Continued from July Issue)

MR. POPPER'S own remedy is that men must change their hearts. He takes little note of the fact that hearts themselves are environmental products. Or to put it another way the beliefs, ideals, theories, for which we seek to gain acceptance are themselves products of social development, i.e. they have a growth and history. Indeed it is only by seeing them as patterns of response in an historical process that they become intelligible. Nor are these responses merely subjective as Mr. Popper seems to think but are brought forth by the needs of men and these needs are part of an objective class conditioned situation.

Ideas, theories, doctrines, are always related to the needs of men in some way or other. Social aims and purposes are for that reason never mere abstractions. Never attempts to realise eternal truth but projections of group needs. That is why the demands for justice, equality, progress, have at bottom been the demands of social groups. It is for that reason "the what is" has ever in practise been directly related to "the what ought to be." The function of "the what ought to be," has been to mask the "this worldliness" of social ends, as an aspect of "the other worldliness."

From this it follows that a ruling social section will always define the good in relation to its own needs. But because we live in a changing world the character and content of its needs undergo historical modification. Sometimes a ruling social group will demand more freedom, more equality. At other times they will proclaim against what they term excesses carried out in the name of these. Sometimes they have called for democracy and toleration, at other times for less democracy and less tolerance. In a world in which they are in social control but cannot control there can be no eternal truths, no fixed values to serve as precepts for final social judgments.

Again it is not true to say that because we cannot know all the ideas which have ever passed through the heads of men or their emotional experiences we cannot know history in any valid or concrete sense. To say that because we do not know everything on a subject we cannot know anything worthwhile, has no more validity in history than any other subject. The ideas Marxism seeks to investigate are the ideas which have brought about significant changes in the social pattern. Not all ideas do this. The various ideas men form in the world in which they live have a greatly varying weight and importance. Many have a purely personal aspect. Some are the outcome of prejudice and attachment. Other ideas are merely cranky. There are ideas which are held one day and discarded the next. And even if we could trace these ideas down to their finest nuances we should find them irrelevant for purposes of historical investigation, for they do not reflect those social forces which are necessary for any major social change.

The point Marxists are interested in, is what gives momentum and power to those ideas which are crucial for social development. The answer is that it is those ideas which are expressions of group interests which are historically effective, for it is these ideas which have been most instrumental in bringing about social change.

Marxism does not, however, view ideas as powers in themselves, capable of conjuring things into existence by pure mental activity. Men can only think within a socially organised continuum. That is why their theories, aims and ends, are moulded by the particular configuration of the society in which they live. It is then a particular historic phase which sets the questions to which men must find the answers. It is because men enter into certain determinate relations with each other that sets the stamp on their interests and activities, and provides the conditions which make their thinking effective.

Mr. Popper, and he is one of legions, accuses Marxism

of social determinism. If Marxism insists that a knowledge of the social forces and those impersonal elements which form part of the social structure of society are essential for forming valid judgments, then we plead guilty. Not to know the relevant facts of a situation is not to know effectively and when there is no effective knowledge, there can be no effective action. Where little or nothing can be proved, everything can be believed. That is why any competent diagnosis, whether it concern our social ills or bodily ills, must be brought under the control of the objective data at our disposal. To recognise that there are determinate limits to a situation is to come to grips with that situation. To choose the alternative, necessary, for the best solution of the problems set, is the first step to freedom. Mr. Popper's contention that Marxism seeks to nullify political action and makes everything dependent on something called inner reality, is nonsense.

Yet (on p. 268) he says that we want to know how our troubles are related to the past, in order to progress towards the solution of what we feel and chose to be our main tasks. Thus it seems that vide Mr. Popper "the what is," definitely links up with "the what was." This would suggest that even Mr. Popper believes that the connection between the past and present is influenced by causal factors; that there has been development and continuity in human affairs. In that case our interpretation of this development process—must be guided by an objective assessment of the available material and not on a subjective judgment based on our particular feelings and thinking. It is the latter which Mr. Popper generally adopts as his criterion for judging history.

When Mr. Popper says we cannot know the past that is true in the sense that the past as the past is physically dead. Yet it is also true that in another sense the past lives on, in so far that elements of the past are always incorporated in some way into the present and just as aspects of the past exist in a reconstituted form in the present, so features of the present will be reconstituted into the fabric of the future. It is because that which has been most significant in the past is linked with the present in a continuous chain of historic events that the structural evolution of human society becomes possible. To seek to reconstruct this evolution into an intelligible pattern is the task of historical investigation. In this way it serves as a present guide to our actions. To suggest that Marxism seeks to make men into marionettes moved by a mysterious force called history is merely a pleasantry of Mr. Popper.

(To be continued)

E. W.

HOW CAPITAL INFLUENCES STRIKES

STRIKES in industry are not always an evil to the employing class. When the markets for goods in a particular industry are over-stocked a strike can be useful to the Capitalists by saving them the trouble of putting workers off and cost of paying those kept on. Hence the best time for workers to strike is during a boom, and the worst time during a slump. Also it is better to strike suddenly than after protracted negotiations which enable the employers to take steps to minimise the embarrassment to themselves. On the same ground long no-strike agreements are harmful because the employers can stockpile against trouble.

These remarks are inspired by a report from the Washington correspondent of the *Observer* (8/7/1956). This report refers to the strike in the American steel

industry over "the length of the contract to be signed between the union and the temporarily united management of the main American steel producers." The report points out the union appears to have been forced to choose a bad time for the assault. The report adds that: "Management insist on a four-year-and-four-month contract—labour would probably settle for three years." The report then follows with statements which illustrate the folly of any long agreements:

"This strike was foreseen, as the labour-management contract expired at the end of June. Industries dependent on steel have been stock-piling against this emergency. It is not known how heavy these 'inventories' are, but it was significant that steel sales were maintained this year, even though the automobile industry and the construction industry suffered a noticeable recession."

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

"The strike, curiously, comes to the Administration as yet another gratuitous and unearned blessing. It was generally expected that in the third quarter of this year the American economy would suffer a noticeable recession. Plant construction has been running at a level that few thought could be maintained. Motor-cars were expected to be still less saleable in the months before the unveiling of what are said to be revolutionary new models.

"If the strike lasts a month, as is expected, it will drain off some embarrassing surpluses. It is also expected with more certainty—to be followed by a production boom. This was the case after the eight-week steel strike in 1952.

"This boom will delay the testing of the economy. It will also approximately and conveniently coincide with the election. It will provide an artificial stimulus to the economy at a time when most economists expected a slump."

This is a striking example of how the dice is loaded against the workers and how Capitalist ownership of the means of production and distribution weights the scales in the conflicts between workers and Capitalists.

GILMAC.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA			
SUNDAYS			
Hyde Park ...	3.30—6 p.m. and 7—10 p.m.		
East Street (Walworth) ...	Aug. 5th	12.30 p.m.	
	" 12th	11 a.m.	
	" 19th	12.30 p.m.	
	" 26th	11 a.m.	
Whitestone Pond (Hampstead) ...		11.30 a.m.	
Finsbury Park ...		11.30 a.m.	
MONDAYS			
Heron Court, Richmond ...		8 p.m.	
WEDNESDAYS			
Gloucester Road Station ...		8 p.m.	
THURSDAYS			
Notting Hill Gate ...		8 p.m.	
FRIDAYS			
Earls Court Station ...		8 p.m.	
Station Road, Ilford ...		8 p.m.	
SATURDAYS			
Jolly Butchers Hill (Nr. Wood Green Stn.) ...		7.30 p.m.	
Ealing Green ...		3.30 p.m.	
Kinston, Castle Street ...		8 p.m.	
LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS			
Tower Hill ...	Thursdays at 1 p.m.		

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

SUMMER SCHOOL

It is proposed to run a Summer School, September 29th and 30th, at Treetops Holiday Camp, Farley Green, Nr. Guildford, Surrey. The charges are quite modest, and a programme has been arranged of 2 lectures and discussions. In addition there will be a social evening on Saturday. Meals are provided, i.e., tea and supper Saturday, breakfast, lunch and tea Sunday.

Those members and sympathisers who wish to attend must reserve places in advance, and all bookings must be pre-paid. Reservations should be made direct to the Central Organiser, and money should be sent to E. Lake, 52 Clapham High Street, S.W.4. The inclusive charge is 22/6.

CENTRAL ORGANISER.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh
OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 1st, 13th and 23rd August, 7.30, at address of R. Lee, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

MAKE CERTAIN YOU GET YOUR "SOCIALIST STANDARD"

Readers who have difficulty in obtaining the SOCIALIST STANDARD through usual channels are urged to take out a Subscription on the Form below.

IMPORTANT TO ALL LONDON MEMBERS MID-DAY MEETINGS

We can resume the meetings at Lincoln's Inn Fields provided that those members who are free can keep the pitch free from parking cars. The period a Comrade should attend is 10.15 a.m. till 12 noon. A number of speakers are prepared to speak provided they can be sure of the speaking pitch.

This station is well worth maintaining, so members PLEASE HELP ASSIST THE PARTY in continuing to maintain this excellent propaganda station.

Propaganda Committee.

TWO PAMPHLETS ON RUSSIA

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—It's Origin and Outcome," (Published by the Socialist Party of Canada, obtainable from S.P.G.B. 50 pages, 6d., post free 8d.)

"RUSSIA SINCE 1917," (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/3).

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months (6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Big Bull's Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. No meetings in August. Next meeting 6th Sept.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reevy Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCELS meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (8th and 22nd August) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kilvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, 13th and 27th August at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to I. MacDougall, 26, Arnprior Quadrant, Castlemilk, S.5.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to O. James, 56, Weymouth Terrace, E.2.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (1st, 15th and 29th August) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, 14th, and 28th August. George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Gisleay, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, S. Hills 1, Devonshire Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOD GREEN AND HORNSEY Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsey, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- ★ Canvass the S.S.
- ★ Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- ★ Submit names for sample copies.
- ★ Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- ★ Get libraries to display the S.S.
- ★ Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.
- ★ Deliver the S.S. to regular Subscribers in your area

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 625 Vol. 52 September, 1956

**STATE CAPITALISM IN
RUSSIA: "PRAYDA"
IS ANNOYED**

**THE REVOLUTION IN
CHINESE MARRIAGE**

**Mr. BEVAN BEING
STATESMANLIKE**

**PROFITS FROM WELFARE
WORK**

THE HOME OWNERS

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

^D
4

What is Behind the Fight for Suez

BECAUSE THEY DO NOT UNDERSTAND the workings of the social system that dominates the world we live in most people see the struggles between political parties and governments in terms of good and evil; good men and good doctrine against evil men and evil doctrine. They see their own "honest, self-sacrificing and reasonable leaders" being prevented from applying just and beneficial policies by the greedy and unprincipled leaders of the other party or nation, and in the atmosphere of fear and anger that conflict arouses they are only too anxious to believe that all the fine sounding principles of law, morality, religion and humanity are on their side; they feel no need to probe deeper for explanations.

The men at the top see more clearly the economic issues and interests involved but as they need to rouse the emotions and win the support of the mass of the people they dress up most of their declarations in the rabble-rousing language likely to move their listeners and readers. So over Suez we have had from the Western politicians a spate of talk about law and illegality, international rights, and wrongs, Fascist acts of plunder, etc., while from the Middle East Nasser and his defenders have worked up themselves and their audiences with passionate speeches about imperialism, oppression, insults to dignity, sovereignty and nationhood.

Not all the utterances are like these. From the "take a strong line" *Sunday Express* (12 August, 1956) came the following:—

"Forget all about the legalistic quibbles, about the rights and wrongs of the Suez dispute. Forget the mumblings of the self-styled moralists about the sort of example Britain should show the world. They do not matter. Only one thing counts. Say it again and again to yourself. If the Suez Canal falls into the control of Nasser, or any other enemy, then Britain is finished. And so are all our hopes for ourselves and our children."

and the like-minded *Daily Mail* (14 August), chiding the *News Chronicle's* opposition to forcible methods and its appeal to "the moral conscience of the world," replied:—

"In international affairs there is, in the ultimate, no moral conscience. . . . It may be sad, but it is true, that self-interest is still the first law of nations. Nasser understands this, even if some people here do not. So do Nehru, Krushchev and Mao Tse-tung. The nation that neglects it goes to the wall."

The *News Chronicle* stands on this issue with those who pride themselves on not being either narrow nationalists or believers in using force in the first place to settle disputes; they believe that an appeal to reason through United Nations will

produce solutions good for all parties and harmful to none. Only with United Nations endorsement should force be used.

The Socialist does not belong to any of these groups, holding that capitalism cannot help engendering conflict and wars and that the only solution is not in the vain hope of running capitalism a different way but of ending capitalism and replacing it by a new and different system of society.

To the Socialist the world is not capable of being divided into the good and the bad statesman and the good and bad nations; they are all Capitalist and all are impelled by the nature of the social system to struggle for markets for their products, for sources of cheap raw materials, and for control of trade routes like Suez and strategic points like Cyprus. These are the things for which they fight, no matter what the fine phrases and slogans in which their aims and motives are garbed.

The crux of the Suez dispute is firstly the oil that exists in abundance in the countries of the Middle East, and secondly the Canal through which much of it, as well as other cargoes, is transported. Oil is now an indispensable fuel for the motors and tractors, aeroplanes and warships, merchant vessels and factories of the countries of the world. With coal production and hydro-electric power failing to keep up with rapidly growing demand for fuel and with atomic power only a development of the not very near future, all countries need oil and many of them, including Britain, have practically none within their own frontiers.

But though the Middle East is reputed to have the biggest oil reserves in the world and extraction is expanding fast, it has a long way to go to catch up with the older oil producing areas.

The world's greatest oil production is still in U.S.A. and Venezuela, which, between them, produce well over half the world's oil. The output of U.S.A. alone in 1955, 2,748 million barrels, is almost equal to that of South America, Europe and the Middle East, and Russia and her satellites, added together (see report of Shell Co. 1955, from which the following figures on oil production are also taken). The total production of the Middle East now exceeds 1,000 million barrels, mostly in Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Iraq and Persia; Egypt has only the trifling output of 13 million. Russia and her satellites produce under 600 million barrels, less than a quarter of the output of U.S.A. Among the late comers, but growing fast, is Canada, with 131 million barrels last year. The great attraction of Middle Eastern oil is that it is much cheaper to extract than oil in the Americas, and the source of Europe's supplies has been switched from West to East. "Before the war most of Europe's oil came from the Western hemisphere; even in 1947 nearly two-thirds of the imports came from the Caribbean or the United States. But in 1955 four-fifths of the imports came from the Middle East" (*Times*, 14 August). At the same time America's internal demand for oil has grown so enormously that some oil is now taken from the Middle East to U.S.A., in preference to using high cost American wells.

The oil industry in the Middle East is mostly controlled by American, British, Dutch and French companies, to whose shareholders large profits flow after paying royalties to the Arab Governments in whose territories they operate and maintain pipe lines.

The magnitude of profits made in the oil business is shown by results for one group, Royal Dutch-Shell, about

an eighth of whose output comes from the Middle East. In 1955 the group made a net profit, after paying taxes, of £160,000,000, of which £33 million was paid out as dividends.

In the Middle East, then, is a great prize for the Power or Powers that can gain control. Each of the Arab countries looks hopefully to being able to squeeze out the oil companies. Egypt's position is different. With practically no oil of its own it has the, at present, irreplaceable Canal through which much of the oil must be shipped. Immediately British troops left the Suez base the way was open for Egyptian capitalism to strike its first blow, which, if it succeeds, will enlarge hopes of achieving the ambition phrased by Col. Nasser as "creating a great Arab Power, stretching from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf." (*Observer*, 12 August, 1956); an ambition about which the other Arab States may have their own ideas.

Faced with this situation the Western countries, now dependent on the Canal, are being forced to consider the much more expensive voyage round South Africa (some new oil tankers are already too big for the Canal), and building more pipe-lines like the American-owned £80 million "Tapline" that stretches over 1,000 miles from Arabia to the Mediterranean—but these too are tempting objects for "nationalisation" by the Governments through whose territory they have to pass.

The Lebanon has already threatened to nationalise pipe-lines, and the *Financial Times* (15 August) expresses the opinion that though existing pipe-lines may be extended it is unlikely that any company will put vast sums into new pipe-lines in view of the risk of nationalisation.

Seemingly the Arab countries are being encouraged to attack the oil companies by the Russian Government, which may hope to get much needed oil in the Middle East or even some form of control of oil resources if Western companies are pushed out. It will be remembered that in 1946, with its armies in occupation, Russia forced Persia to agree to put North Persia oil under Russian control for 50 years; but when the troops withdrew Persia blandly declined to ratify the concession.

It has been a matter for comment that the American Government held back from the more belligerent Anglo-French threats of using force against Egypt. Apart from pre-occupation with winning the forthcoming presidential election and the fact that Suez is not a major American interest, the American Government and even the American companies with big holdings in Middle Eastern oil, are not greatly concerned with the Anglo-French fear that if Egypt nationalises the Canal this will encourage the Middle East Governments to nationalise the oil wells. The American Government has in the past encouraged Middle East oil production partly in order to conserve her home oil resources but the growing importance of Canadian oil may reduce this need. Also the *Observer's* Washington correspondent reports a divergent view among American oil companies themselves:—

"Another group opposed to any military action over the Suez Canal is the American oil industry. Several oil companies are reported to have expressed the view that they can protect their interests best for quite a long time by making monetary concessions to the Arab States if necessary. This, the companies think, is possible because the cost of extracting oil is much lower in the Middle East than it is in North America, or even Latin America." (*Observer*, 12th August, 1956.)

The South African and Canadian Governments were also lukewarm in their attitude to the issue, and why not?

South Africa would welcome more shipping going round the Cape, and Canadian capitalism has its hands full building up its own oil industry.

At the time of writing the discussions between the Powers have not produced a settlement though the evident lack of war-fever among British workers and the disinclination of other Governments to back up Britain and France in forcible action against Egypt have had some effect in restraining the Eden Government and its supporters.

On the other hand Arab workers, misled by the belief that nationalisation of the Canal Co. (and eventual nationalisation of the oil industry) is in their interest, have been reported as giving vigorous backing to their Governments.

This is the real tragedy of the Suez dispute, that there is no unity among the workers of the different coun-

tries in opposing the war-talk of their Governments. In the main the trade unions in each country give such large measure of support to the claims of their own Capitalists and Governments that the basis does not exist on which they could act in unity with the workers of other countries when a clash of Capitalist interest is involved. Not realising the possibility and necessity of building a social system in which production solely for use will replace production for sale in competitive markets, because private property is the means of production and distribution will have given place to common property, the workers of the world do not realise that their common interest should unite them impartially against Eden, Nasser, Krushchev, Eisenhower, and all their kind. The trouble, as we said at the beginning, is that most people do not yet understand the workings of the social system, Capitalism.

H.

FRESH THINKING WITH STALE IDEAS

EVERY now and again in the radical movement there crop up attempts "to think out afresh the foundations of a Socialist faith and its implications in the modern world." The alleged "fresh" thinking always turns out to be a rehash of earlier attempts to bypass the obstacle of universal working class understanding; each attempt also overlooks, or is ignorant of, the fact the old ground is covered again in much the same way as it was covered in the past. Always the world of production and distribution is supposed to have thrown up some aspects that merits a change in outlook—but the outlook does not change; it is just the same reformist outlook attempting to iron out some of the wrinkles that mar the smooth running of the Capitalist social system.

These attempts at "fresh" thinking are generally the work of "intellectuals" whose ideas are not rooted in the working class movement, and who feel frustrated and confined in their efforts to make a mark in the world. The fruit of their work has always boiled down to the oiling of the machinery of capitalism to reduce some of the squeaks though the "fresh" thinkers have been too "intellectual" to notice this.

Since the war there has been a plague of this furbishing up of stale ideas. In earlier times the touchstone of the "new" thinking was Social Democracy; since 1917 it has been Russia. Now the Communists are torn by a plethora of it, and, in this country, have even issued a journal, "The Reasoner," as "a Journal of Discussion," to re-examine the views they have been putting forward as established truth for nearly 40 years. What they are doing is going back to the earlier arguments over Dictatorship, which figured under the misleading and nonsensical title of "democratic centralism." Again and again we pointed out in our columns, in the early twenties, the absurdity of attaching the name democracy to the rigid centralised dictatorship of the Bolsheviks. Apparently some Communists and fellow-travellers are at last beginning to have doubts about dictatorship. But the basis of their discussions, like the "new" thinking of the past, will get them nowhere because, like their forbears, they accept commodity production, as a continuing state of affairs, and the swindle that, with all its faults, the Russian State Capitalist system is really Socialist.

In the U.S.A., at the beginning of the thirties, there was also an upsurge of "new" thinking. The "Modern



Quarterly" for the winter 1930-31 contained several pages of this controversy. One of the participants was Lewis Mumford. V. F. Calverton replied to him effectively, but his reply was marred by his sympathy with the general Russian outlook.

We will give some quotations from Mumford, and readers will recognise the similarity between his ideas and those that are going the round to-day. After referring to what was happening in Russia he stated that in America they were faced with an entirely different set of conditions. That although there were many and serious evils in America under which workers suffered:

"It is not the presence of prosperity, but the absence of terror, hunger and desperation that makes a revolution in the Russian sense of the word remote. More important, however, than the lack of desperate incentive is the fact that our society, unlike that of Russia in 1917, is a highly complicated industrial one, and the operation of our industries requires a high order of intelligent co-operation. . . . A revolution in America must be accomplished as the Grand Central Station was built tearing down the old, building up the new, and keeping the train service on schedule, all at the same time."

The last few lines is the key to his outlook. The little by little and bit by bit attitude of the reformers. He puts his view more clearly later on:

"Our society, then, will not be changed by a catastrophe; it will be changed by the continuous pressure of economic groups, working towards concrete ends, the control of an industry, the socialization of a municipal utility, the nationalization of a resource, the planning of great public works."

Well we have had all these in this country, and the result? In last month's SOCIALIST STANDARD we quoted Sir Anthony Eden's statement that unless inflation could be got rid of we were going downhill to poverty for ourselves and our children. Which shows how valueless, from the working class point of view, is all this planning and building like the Grand Central Station. It has no effect worth talking about on the fundamental basis of capitalism—on the class cleavage between workers and Capitalists. Who does, and must, carry out the planning that Mumford mentions? The Government of course—the Executive Committee of the ruling class. In face of this the following grandiose statements by Mumford reveal his fatuity:

"In back of these concrete changes must be the sense of general ends and ultimate goals; the growth of a common culture, the development of friendly ways of living; the spread and renewal of the arts and sciences and their infiltration into every aspect of life; for without such ends all our material renovations will be baseless and impermanent. To be conscious of these ends and to project them vividly is one of the definite rôles of the intellectual in preparing for the transformation."

Well, how has it gone with the world, and with Mumford, and his like, since he wrote those words? We have suffered a gigantic war, we have seen the fratricidal strife in India, the Korean War and others, and we are living in dread of the destructive power of the Hydrogen Bomb. At the moment, also, the Suez Canal is the centre of a conflict that has an ultimate goal alright but has nothing to do with the development of friendly ways of living. We have also witnessed the many somersaults of the "Intellectuals" in different fields.

Mumford, himself, is not an exception to this charge. The man who urged the development of friendly ways of living turned jingo in 1939, calling Americans to arms to fight Germany. Mumford's book "Men Must Act," published in 1939, was a criticism of British policy for giving

way to Hitler and urging the "democracies" to fight. In the preface he says:

"The internal contradictions and conflicts that have piled up in Soviet Russia will remove, in all probability, the one menace that need cause a moment's concern: the possibility of their effecting a tacit alliance with Fascist governments." (Page 15.)

Of course the "intellectual" leader, Mumford, was entirely wrong. Russia did form an actual alliance with Germany and took part in the dismemberment of Poland. Mumford winds up his preface as follows:

"Democracy has still a fighting chance of surviving in the present world, on one condition, that it is prepared to fight. The main purpose of this book is to rally together those in America who have a firm belief in democracy; but its ultimate appeal is to men of good will throughout the world. . . .

"If we are ready to die rather than submit to Fascism we may still establish a world in which peaceful men may again, not unhelpfully, live. . . . Every man and woman must face this choice."

Well Fascism was defeated and now we are hopefully living under the threat of the Hydrogen Bomb, and the world is a maelstrom of trouble. Mumford is just a glaring example of the ineptitude of the "intellectual," except as a tool to help sections of the master class out of trouble.

Before concluding we must make one more quotation from Mumford's article in the American Quarterly:

"What, then, must be the attitude of the intellectual in America who seeks to further a creative transformation of our society? He must aim to keep alive in himself the essentials that are needed in a whole society which is oriented to the good life."

Was he doing that when he shouted for war? He certainly helped to send the cream of youth to a bad death, even if he aimed to keep himself alive.

But the "new" thinkers are all the same. They are windy purveyors of stale ideas and tools of the ruling class—even if unconsciously.

GILMAC.

THE REVOLUTION IN CHINESE MARRIAGE

THE establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, despite the usual misleading Communist phraseology, marked the completion of the Capitalist revolution there. The new system of society which is emerging from it has changed many things hitherto fundamental to the Chinese way of life, and not the least of these is marriage.

The majority of people, both in Europe and Asia, regard their existing form of marriage, together with the sexual morality that their society claims as sacrosanct, as something permanent, something that always has been and always will continue. But, in fact, marriage laws and sexual morality change in keeping with changing social systems.

Early Chinese Marriage

In ancient times in China the aristocracy were married with elaborate rites and ceremonies. The wife of an aristocrat would be associated in the rites of her husband's ancestral temple; the temple of his "Clan." Marriage was particularly important because property was involved and the heirs' legal claim to the estate had to be established.

But the peasants were not included in the clan system,

had no surname or pedigrees, and consequently could not participate in ancestor-worship. Moreover, they did not possess any land of their own. They were serfs, cultivating their master's soil under his direction. They dwelt in groups in villages during the harsh winter, and in huts built among the fields during the summer when agriculture was possible. Every spring, the peasants celebrated a festival in which the youths and girls of neighbouring villages met in free association, only translated into formal marriage in the autumn if the girls were with child.

The Traditional Chinese Marriage

Feudalism was abolished in China in 300 B.C. and replaced by a unified central government ruling through a civil service. Wealth increased rapidly, and extended to fresh groups of the population. This spread of private property necessitated a change in morality as well as in the marriage customs of the population for peasants wished to leave their farms to their own sons, and marriage, therefore, became a social necessity for them. But the heavy tasks of draining farmland in the marshy valleys and the irrigation works that were needed afterwards, required the labour of large family groups.

A system of ethics was evolved which was expressed

by the teachings of the sage Confucius, laying down a code of behaviour to cover all relationships. The submission of the subject to the ruler, and, within the family, the submission of the individual to the head of the household. Moreover there were rules formulated to cover relationships such as between younger brother and elder brother, husband and wife, wife and mother-in-law. Thus Confucianism not only made the task of ruling over vast China easier, but enabled the individuals in these otherwise unwieldy family groups to live together in more or less harmony and co-operation. Some of those whose mothers-in-law lived with them as one of the family may perhaps have received an inkling of the desirability of such regulating of family life and behaviour.

This somewhat puritanical code of Confucianist morals was rigidly adhered to in conservative China, where changes were extremely gradual because the Chinese made their living by engaging in small scale intensive agriculture, which has developed very slowly right down through the ages until a few years ago. It also forms the philosophic basis for the literary classics, a thorough knowledge of which was necessary to pass the civil service examinations.

In China until recent times it was the custom for the parents of the bride and bridegroom to be brought into contact by a marriage broker, the parents being the final arbiters on the suitability of the proposed union. The couple had no say in the choice and moreover did not meet before the ceremony. The Chinese compared this form of betrothal with a cold pot that is put on the fire and gradually heats up; whereas marriage in the West usually taking place after courtship was likened to a pot boiling at the time of the ceremony, but thereafter beginning to cool off.

Marriage in "Communist" China

The Marriage Law of the Peoples Republic of China, which came into force on 1st May, 1950, indicates the need for a new set of family rules to govern behaviour in this new Capitalist system of society. It reveals too an interesting side-light on some of the social changes taking place there; for it is only to be expected that China, the latest recruit to the State Capitalist system, should adopt the most up-to-date set of Capitalist marriage laws.

Article 1 of the new law formally abolishes the previous marriage system, and in its place institutes the "New Democratic" Marriage Law which, it states, is based on free choice of partners, on monogamy, on equal rights for both sexes, and of the lawful interest of women and children.

"Husband and wife are companions living together and shall enjoy equal status in the home. Both shall have the right to free choice of occupation and free participation in work or social activities."

Other Articles deal with prohibition of bigamy and concubinage. The local government is delegated to issue the marriage certificates.

The change in the status of women has the advantage for the ruling-class that the women are "free" to become wage-workers.

Rights and duties are further detailed, as well as the relations between parents and children; and divorce is to be granted only when the efforts of the local government officials have failed to bring about a reconciliation. After appropriate measures have been taken for the care of children and property, divorce certificates are to be issued without delay. Both parents still have the duty to support their children. In case of divorce, the wife shall retain

such property as belonged to her before her marriage.

As a further indication of the trend of society in modern China, 12 out of the 27 articles that go to make up this law deal wholly or partly with money or property matters.

For the smooth running of capitalism, workers must conform to the rules of behaviour which have been found suitable for the social system; and because the needs of capitalism are similar *irrespective of which part of the globe is involved*, the marriage laws, which codify a part of this behaviour pattern are also similar, differing only in detail in the various national sections of the Capitalist world.

It is understandable that the new Chinese marriage law abolishes the previous marriage system; it is in the interest of the Capitalists to try to increase the surplus value obtained from the labour of the workers, who are induced to speed up their work by the prospects of a higher standard of living. This elusive prize is dangled before them, like the carrot before the donkey's nose. Moreover, in order to get the Chinese worker to work harder, the old-fashioned household, consisting of several related families sharing the income of their wage-earners, has had to be broken up into smaller units; in this way the wage-earner and his immediate family receive all the benefit from his wages.

The breaking-up of this now out-moded household into the more modern form of family unit has the further advantage, from the Capitalist point of view, that the parents, because the family is now dependent on their sole earnings, are more amenable to Capitalist demands. Hence, the new marriage laws of China, by substituting for child betrothals, the "free choice" of husband and wife and by fixing the responsible minimum marrying ages for women and men, transfer the responsibility for the marriage, financially and otherwise, from the large family group to a smaller family unit; the unit which is now considered normal in the Capitalist world.

This change in the status of women has evoked great interest in China, and Chinese newspapers and magazines frequently carry photos showing the various jobs women have undertaken. One day the Peking newspapers carried on their front pages photographs of women proudly driving the local trams, other pictures showed women repairing these trams, and others, gear-cutting in the machine building shops. A picture of a group of smiling nurses had a caption to the effect that 85,000 medical assistants were to be trained in the next five years. On the railways some of the engine crews are women and there is a train on the Peking-Tientsin run entirely staffed by women whose photographs show them as being understandably pleased with their accomplishments. There are many pictures published of proud "Labour Heroines"—those pace-setters of China's industrialisation drive.

Work teams composed of functionaries of the People's Court and members of the Democratic Womens' Federation and the Youth League, visit the villages to see that the Marriage Law is properly enforced. They help to settle marital disputes on the spot and illustrate the merits of the law through plays, skits and lantern slide exhibitions.

It is reported that the special panel meetings for husbands and mothers-in-law are proving very effective.

But as a lotus petal separated from the flower is carried along in the grip of the wind, so have the women of China been broken away from the relatively secure group-

household to start on a separate course of life. This has at least begun with great hopes of happiness. The publication of the Marriage Law was accompanied by articles written by leading Chinese personalities—the Vice-President of the Supreme People's Court and the Vice-Chairman of the All-China Democratic Women's Federation—anticipating domestic bliss as a consequence of the operation of this law. In other parts of the globe where somewhat similar laws obtain, the mounting figures of divorces, separations, and juvenile delinquency resulting from broken homes, give cause for doubts about such optimism.

And in China, some of the smiles must surely have changed to tears by now, for another photograph published later shows a parting between a young mother and her toddler at the entrance to a factory nursery. The caption reads—"Come, dear! Let your mother go to work."

Other pictures show women members of the armed forces in Korea of whom it is stated that they are merely in the medical corps but that others are taking part in the fighting as combat troops. This information has been borne out by reports in Western newspapers of women figuring in the fighting in Korea. Thus is the road to woman's "emancipation" via blood, toil, tears and sweat."

And so the world changes. But the more things change the more they often really stay the same; for in a class-dominated society so many reforms, on the eve of fulfilment, turn to dust and ashes. By the promulgation and enforcement of the Marriage Law of the Peoples' Republic of China are the women of China free—free to become wage-slaves.

F. OFFORD.

THE CRITICS CRITICISED

PROFESSOR POPPER LOOKS AT HISTORY

(Continued from August Issue)

MR. POPPER is what may be styled a militant christian. His social doctrine is the familiar secularised interpretation of the New Testament. We must cast out false idols—lust for power; seek humility, do things for their own sake, be guided by our conscience, etc., and all this in a world where profit is the ruling motive, power politics a normal social mechanism, and where the vast majority are excluded from control and genuine participation in the wealth producing agencies. The social ethics of Mr. Popper are the age long belief of all social reformists. The belief that humanity will triumph over lust for profit, and power, while leaving the basis of the present system intact. Mr. Popper, like so many other social reformers, seems to regret the fact that under capitalism, Capitalists continue to behave like Capitalists and not as ardent humanitarians and social philanthropists.

Again selfishness or unselfishness are not attributes intrinsically good or bad as the abstract morality of Christ, Kant, and perhaps Mr. Popper, maintains. They can only be given real content in the social environment in which they arise and the purpose and ends which give effect to these attributes. Thus a section of the community, fighting to resist encroachments on its standards of living, may impose hardships on others, to call upon them to cease their struggles would be to ask them to sacrifice their own human interests. Mr. Popper talks about morality but fails to see that the watershed of any genuinely human morality must be the concrete needs of men. The Marxists maintain that only the abolition of social privilege based on ownership can best serve the concrete needs of the vast majority and hence constitute the truly human morality.

Mr. Popper, while he soft peddles on the present system, finds it easy to take the organ stops out when dealing with the past. For him power politics loom most large in the story of men. It is the story of the powerful and wicked against the weak and virtuous. How it came about we are never really informed or why it took the social forms it did. As such it does not explain the past, it merely explains it away.

While Marx never ceased to roundly condemn the

cruelties and stupidities of the past and present, he never attributed social evils to be basically the outcome of wickedness on one hand or the ineptitude of virtue on the other. Instead of passing empty categorical judgments on those who have gone before, Marx insisted that men's actions should be studied in the light of the social situation which initiated and gave meaning to them. Marx held that all systems based on a class structures tended to perpetuate a set of beliefs, theories, and social Rationalisations in keeping with the needs of the ruling section, and because the privileged minority are by virtue of their social position, connected with the agencies which disseminate social ideologies they are not only able to exert a major emphasis on those ideas favourable to their interests but to set the tone of the extant cultural pattern which produces the social pressures which make for uniformity of outlook among all members of a given society. What is known as the general outlook will prevail until it is challenged effectively by counter beliefs set up in the interests of a new social group. It is from the warp and the woof of the generally accepted ideas that social ideals and doctrines are formed. That is why although the pages of history tell of man's inhumanity to man and reek with blood of the innocent, there has never been a lack of social doctrines to justify men's deeds.

Marx calls this incongruence between the ideals which men set up and the real nature of the social relations on whose behalf these ideals function—"false consciousness." This is not due to some grave moral defect in human nature, or to a lack of logical consistency in their theories and beliefs but to a set of social beliefs which, under the guise of acting on behalf of what is known as "the general interests," are projections of certain group wills and interests and thus act as polarising and refractory agents on the social vision of men. It is because of this process of social deception that men become victims of their own ideologies. And abstractions like justice, freedom, the rights of man, etc., not only become battle cries but take on the character of real things. While men then have been guilty of all manner of cruelties in the name of ideologies they have to a great extent been innocent of the real sources from which they sprang. No amount of cruelty or slaughter, Marx thought would correct this de-

ception, nor we might add, moralising platitudes. Only when men grasp the real content of the relations between themselves and nature can a socialised humanity emerge. The verdict of Marx on history reveals a more profound and more tolerant attitude than the crude denunciations of Mr. Popper.

Marx was also opposed to judging human beings by some absolute scale of ethical values. He believed that men must be appraised by the standards of their time. No doubt members of the Capitalist class would be horrified at the idea of keeping slaves. Yet are we to believe that the slave owners of the 18th and 19th centuries were wicked men? They certainly did not think so. Judged in accordance with their own lights they were not exempt from humane feeling and consideration. They did not, however, oppose slavery or demand its abolition, no more than the employing class demand the abolition of capitalism based on wage slavery. Socialists demand the abolition of capitalism not because Capitalists as such are inhuman or lack consideration, but because the form and content of their humanity and ethical values are circumscribed by the type of social organisation of which they are the social representatives. Our claim is that ethical values do not function independently of the social context in which they are expressed and which Mr. Popper should have sought to prove but he never did. Only when class division has ceased to count in human affairs will the meanness, hatred, cruelty and antagonism which are so much features of contemporary culture disappear and the values and motives of Capitalist society be replaced by more humane values and more humane motives.

Mr. Popper follows the traditions of the Fabians, Bertrand Russell, G. D. H. Cole, and others, in seeing the

value of Marxism as a moral appeal. Marx, however, sharply disassociated himself from the utopians. As Marx pointed out "the utopians have a bent to interpret surplus value in moral terms and then appeal to society for correction of its glaring injustices." For Marx, morality had to rest upon a theory of objective conditions to ensure its success.

Some of Mr. Popper's inadequate ideas of Marxism can be seen from his assertion that Marx held that the rate of profit must fall (p. 184), when Marx held no such view. Another idea he puts forward, that Marx also held that the fall in the rate of profit was an automatic process for the increasing misery of the workers (p.p. 183-185). What Marx said was that the tendency of the rate of profit to fall was an incentive for Capitalists to attempt to increase productivity. He never said that all increases in productivity go to the Capitalist in the shape of profits. Some go to workers in higher wages but he maintained never proportionately to the productive power of labour. Again we are told that Marx held that wages oscillate round starvation level (p. 173). Marx again did not say it but emphatically denied it. How Marx vide Mr. Popper came to believe that workers' conditions would continue to worsen from starvation levels, he Mr. Popper does not explain. Finally he repeats the hoary myth that Marx held that capitalism would crash (p. 179).

If we seem to have spent much time on Mr. Popper it is not in deference to his criticism on Marxism, but because he has in his book summarised most of the criticism of Marx in the last 50 years. The views on Marxism and history held by Mr. Popper can themselves be summarised as mostly Poppercock.

(Concluded).

E. W.

NOTES BY THE WAY

Mr. Bevan being Statesmanlike

When he is not calling other supporters of capitalism vermin the Rt. Hon. Aneurin Bevan sometimes writes sober, statesmanlike articles for the Capitalist Press as in the *Sunday Express* (5 August, 1956). His subject was "Why I want Ike to Lose." Although Bevan is not a Socialist he likes to parade himself as one on the strength of his continuing support for State Capitalism (nationalisation), and one would have expected the article to be a trumpet blast for setting up an English-model "Welfare State" in U.S.A. and a repudiation of Eisenhower because he and his party are not likely to do it. But not at all. The article said nothing about America's need for Bevan's State Capitalist schemes (and naturally nothing about Socialism). It said hardly anything about any policy, beyond a tepid preference for Adlai Stevenson on the ground that he would change the American attitude towards Chiang-Kai-Shek, and might finally end McCarthyism. All he could say about Stevenson was that "his views are not particularly advanced, judged by Europe's standards, and there are even some Conservatives who might not think him sufficiently progressive."

No, Mr. Bevan's main and almost his only theme was that Eisenhower is sick and consequently liable to reactionary pressure—as if the course of American capitalism is going to be determined by Eisenhower, well or ill. But Mr. Bevan evidently thinks it is:—

"I find the project depressing in the extreme. The President is obviously a sick man and by all the evidence he is likely to become more and not less sick. We shall therefore have less than half a man failing to do what is by general consent a job more than enough for a man in full possession of robust health. The most important political office in the world will be in feeble, fumbling and wavering hands, and it is little consolation that it may be done by the democratic choice of the American people themselves."

So Mr. Bevan can pass by without comment the fact that the American people by democratic choice are about to rivet themselves to capitalism again; this he does not think worth notice; but he is very depressed because American capitalism may be in the hands of a semi-invalid. As if by comparison with the real issue it had any importance at all, except for Mr. Eisenhower.

Bevan Looking in the Mirror

This attitude towards politics does explain why Mr. Bevan got so angry with Attlee and now dislikes Attlee's successor, Gaitskell. When Bevan looks in the mirror he sees a whole man, in robust health; obviously better fitted to lead the Labour Party and become Prime Minister than these fumbling half men.

But how does Bevan work out, in wider spheres, his policy of supporting the robust and opposing the weak? In the same issue of the *Sunday Express* "Cross Bencher"

(Continued on page 137)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

SEPTEMBER



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

STATE CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA
PRAVDA IS ANNOYED

ANDRE PHILIP, who recently visited Russia with a delegation of members of the "Socialist Party of France," wrote up an account of what he saw and heard for the *Manchester Guardian* (his articles appeared in the issues of 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8, August). On August 8 the *Guardian* also published an article dealing with an attack on Philip which appeared in the Moscow *Pravda* on 28 July, 1956. *Pravda* devoted a quarter of its space on that day to criticism of what Philip had said about Russia on his return to France. Above all *Pravda* was angry because Philip denied that there is Socialism in Russia, describing it as "State Capitalism."

Pravda's argument to prove that Russia has Socialism is as follows:—

"In the Soviet Union the means of production are the property of the working people. Since there are no capitalists, how can there be any talk about State capitalism? There is no capitalist ownership; there are no exploiting classes. This is the complete triumph of Socialism."

Pravda goes on to lecture Philip on the meaning of the word Socialism that has been "accepted by Socialist thought throughout the world for more than a century." This meaning, according to the Russian newspaper, is "the liquidation of the private ownership of the means of production and the transfer of the means of production to public ownership."

The thing that must strike the Socialist on reading this stuff is that *Pravda* writes just like some woolly-minded member of the Labour Party trying to prove that since the railways and coal mines have been "transferred to public ownership" that they are now the property of the working class. We have heard it all before, from the MacDonalds, Attlees and Bevens, and now we have to hear it from the Communists.

Our first point in reply to *Pravda* is to deny the truth of the statement about what Socialist thought has accepted for a century. What exists in Russia is not in the least

like the definition of Socialism used by Socialists. In Russia production and distribution are largely in the hands of the Government as are the coal mines and railways, etc., here. They are operated to produce commodities for sale at a profit, and backing them financially is the very large Russian national debt owned by large and small bondholders. There is in Russia as great (or even greater) inequality of income as in this country though not as great inequality of ownership of accumulated wealth. Also though Russia has private trading it has not the British company system of shareholders.


This is State capitalism just as are the nationalised industries in Britain. And when did Socialists ever describe it as Socialism? We can of course answer for ourselves that the S.P.G.B. never did so on any occasion since its formation in 1904.

And if, as *Pravda* maintains, Socialists for a century have used the name Socialism to mean what exists in Russia why is this flatly contradicted in Communist works published before this distortion of the word had been decided upon. Let the Communists look for example at "A Short Course of Economic Science," by A. Bogdanoff, published in 1923, by the Communist Party of Great Britain. Here we were informed that Socialism is "the highest stage of society we can conceive" (p. 391), that "under Socialism the question of profits will disappear in production also" (p. 380); and that "with the establishment of Socialism, all taxes, including the progressive income tax, will become superfluous" (p. 295).

Perhaps *Pravda* will now tell us how it squares the above, which is what Communists used to say, with what they say now about alleged Socialism in Russia, for not even *Pravda* can deny that an elaborate system of differential taxation exists (including a profits tax) and that the State concerns are required to make a profit or show good reason for not doing so.

Pravda might also recall that back in the nineteen-twenties Lenin was advocating State Capitalism in Russia (see his "Chief Task of our Times") and not pretending that it is Socialism as does *Pravda* now.

Before we leave the subject a word to Andre Philip. He is quite right to point out that the Russian system is not Socialism but State Capitalism, but is he always so clear-headed and outspoken about the muddle-headed propaganda carried on by his own party in France?



"SOMEONE ISN'T USING DECENCY"

NOTES BY THE WAY—continued from page 135

reported that Mr. R. A. Butler is a robust man, too:—"His cheeks glow. His step is light. And he is only 53."

And what about Colonel Nasser, who is described as "a tall, strongly built man, with great physical stamina?"

Nationalisation and the Arab Workers

The Arab workers' trade unions in Egypt and other Middle-Eastern countries, have given delighted support to the act of nationalising the Suez Canal and the threatened nationalisation of oil plants and oil pipe-lines. They think their troubles will be over when "their country owns their oil and their canal." They have a rude awakening in store when they find that the beneficiaries will be their exploiters, the local Capitalist class. But what a pity they could not learn from the experience of workers in Britain, Russia and other countries about the illusory benefits of State Capitalism. The people who ought to have told them are the British and other trade union leaders who have international contacts, but they, of course, still cherish the same illusions themselves.

Colonel Nasser has used against the Western Powers the argument that as Egyptian workers built the Canal "Egypt" should own it. But the same can be said of all the accumulated wealth of Egypt and all other countries; the workers produced it but somebody else owns it. The Colonel very well knows that nationalisation is not going to take the wealth of Egypt out of the hands of the rich who own it. If he had any such dangerous thoughts and suggested applying them he would soon be got rid of.

U.N.—The Dream Fades

Except as a face-saver and rubber stamp organisation for the big Powers, nobody seriously considered United Nations as a body to provide a solution for the Suez Canal dispute. A correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* at Geneva comments on the parallel disillusioning with one of U.N.'s subsidiaries the United Nations Economic and Social Council. He comments on the failure of this council in the fields of world trade and economic development and goes on:—

"What is considered even more serious, however, is the growing impression among the delegates that, just as in the field of effective world security, the United Nations is becoming almost impotent in the economic and social fields as well. It seems as if there were an unspoken agreement among the industrial as well as the less developed countries that the United Nations has been reduced to a forum where lip-service has to be paid to ideals which no longer apply to the level of sophistication which has now been universally reached. Articles of the United Nations Charter seem to serve as no more than good debating points."—(*Manchester Guardian*, 9th August, 1956.)

The Results of Kier Hardie

On the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Kier Hardie he has been acclaimed by both wings of the Labour Party and by the Communist *Daily Worker*. He is not acclaimed by the S.P.G.B. any more than he was when he was alive; though we must in fairness admit that when we contemplate the low level of the present Labour Party notabilities it does add a certain relative lustre to Kier Hardie. And this, of course, pin-points our attitude towards his reformist activities and his masterpiece the formation of the Labour Party. His admirers tell us what fine and enduring work he did but they are vague about what it was and why it should be admired. Surely the test to be applied to a man who believed that the way to get Socialism was to build up a trade union-political, re-

formist Labour Party, is to examine his success in achieving what, he said, it would achieve.

Mr. Bevan, in an article "The man who still points the Way" (*Reynolds News*, 12 August, 1956), has this to say:—

"We are not yet even within sight of the 'just society' that Kier Hardie dreamed about. The society we belong to is not only still unjust, it is also unstable. We lurch unsteadily from one crisis to another with the sole satisfaction that our feet are better shod than they were in Hardie's day."

Mr. Bevan puts it very well, but what becomes of the claim of Hardie and the other reformists about the superior wisdom of reformism? And incidentally what were Mr. Bevan and the other members of the Labour Governments doing to leave society in such a mess?

One of Kier Hardie's mistaken beliefs was that the problem of war could be dealt with under capitalism. Now, half a century later, Mr. Bevan tells us in effect, that if we disappear in an H.-Bomb war it will be nice to know that our feet are dry.

Ziliacus on Egypt and Israel

Mr. Ziliacus, Labour M.P., for Gorton, is one of the Labour Party M.P.'s who do not approve of Eden's policy towards Egypt, or of his own leader's policy. He wrote to the *Manchester Guardian* (6 August, 1956), to put his point of view. He attacked Mr. Gaitskell's statement that the Suez episode "Must be recognised as part of the struggle for the mastery of the Middle East" and declared that "to contemplate going to war is madness," this because Nasser has behind him the whole of the Arab world as well as support from outside.

But point four of his four point explanation of his position included "as an immediate emergency measure, the arming of Israel..."

One wonders therefore just what Mr. Ziliacus does think. Against whom is Israel to be armed if not against Egypt and the Arab countries? And since this involves the possibility of war what happens to the view that contemplating going to war is madness, especially as he also wants "the guaranteeing of peace between Israel and the Arab States?" "Guaranteeing" frontiers means being prepared to go to war.

They're Fascists!

Trying to interpret events in the international dogfight in terms of how much you like the politicians and how friendly you think they are becomes confusing because the actors keep on changing places and changing colours.

Sir Anthony Eden likens Nasser to Hitler (to which the Colonel with more politeness seems to have made no retort in kind), but similarity to the late Nazi leader and his crimes is just what the Greeks have been seeing in Eden because of Cyprus.

The Communists have had the same trouble. Some readers of the *Daily Worker* have objected to the Communist Party's support for dictator Nasser's policy on the ground that Nasser is anti-Israel, while Communists in Stepney "are pro-Israel." To which another *Daily Worker* reader retorts that the manner in which the rulers of Israel treat the Arab minority is "fascist-like." (*Daily Worker*, 8 August.)

But a well-known "expert" on world affairs, Mr. Stephen King-Hall thinks that the British Government should use their trump card, the existence of Israel which

he describes as "the only democratic State in the Middle East." (*Manchester Guardian*, 8 August).

The odd thing is that they all now use "Fascist" and "Nazi" as terms expressing obhorrence, forgetting how all of them have been willing to do a deal with Mussolini, Hitler or anyone else when in need of allies.

Which prompts a further note on the use of language. Why has not "you're like Stalin," come into common use as term of abuse? What did Adolf have that Josef hadn't got?

Profits from "Welfare" work

"Industrial Relations News" of New York announce publication of a book called "The Dollars and Sense of Human Relations in Industry." It sets out to answer the question "Do Human relations programmes pay their own way?"

The publicity leaflet notes that "companies to-day are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on human relations courses for supervisors, house organs for employees, recreation facilities, attitude surveys, and many other types of human relations programmes."

It's their money and they want to know what they get for it, in addition to a nice warm feeling.

So the editors "investigate the many areas in which good human relations can result in definite dollars-and-cents contributions to company success."

This sort of thing must be a bit of a problem to honest christians who have been brought up to believe that they have to choose between wealth and goodness and can't have both. Under this enlightened, modern capitalism christian Capitalists have to have both whether they like it or not. They seek goodness by providing welfare

for their wage-slaves and the only result is to give them more dollars and cents than ever.

Another line on "human relations" concerns protective clothing worn in factories and warehouses, dealt with in an article "How Clothing Can Help Production" ("Furniture Record," 13 July, 1956). The writer, Mr. F. S. Winfield, Managing Director of Raynor, Webber and Stiles Ltd., claims that much study is given to the advantages of such clothing apart from its function as protective against accidents and against damage to ordinary dress.

Putting women workers into smart uniform, working garments prevents envy from interfering with concentration on work:—

"The modish new spring skirt of a young unmarried operative cannot, for instance, be the object of rueful contrast during working hours with, say, the sad-looking frock that middle-aged widow has had to make do for with a couple of years."

It has been found, the writer says, that "identification of rank by colour differentiation has a marked effect on discipline and bearing. . . ."

And when one firm decided to put all its men into clean overalls, washed each week by the firm, the result, within a week, was "an appreciable improvement in the tidiness and appearance of the machine shop."

The article ends:—

"As more and more firms undertake to issue their workers with protective clothing, it becomes increasingly clear that the American conception of the provision of these facilities as an investment certain to show profitable returns in extra smartness and extra enthusiasm is a correct one."

The personnel experts call their study of how to get profitable reactions from the workers "human relations." It is about as human as the preparation of thousands of pay sheets by an electronic computer.

H.

THE HOME OWNERS

(Reproduced from the "Western Socialist," Boston Massachusetts, May-June, 1956).

THIS is the saga of American home-ownership and American home-owners—of that not inconsiderable percentage of theoretical homeowners in the United States who are a part of the working-class. Let us begin with a scientific generalization.

The working-class, we Socialists maintain, is a propertyless class which owns nothing but its labour-power, its ability to produce. In exchange for this labour-power which the workers sell to the Capitalist class they receive back on the average enough of the necessities and the luxuries to keep them producing and reproducing themselves as a class. Home-ownership is certainly not to be figured as a part of the cost of producing and reproducing labour-power.

In the face of appearances, however, this would seem to be rather a bumptious statement insofar as the American working-class is concerned. There is, without doubt, a mountain of paper in the form of deeds and titles of ownership to homes of all types which might be found in the possession of American working-people and the ledgers in the nation's registries of deeds will bear this out. On the other hand, however, there is another mountain of paper in the form of first and second mortgages, liens and attachments and so forth reposing in the nation's banks and finance companies which fairly well serves to uphold the validity of the Socialist claim and which exposes working-class home-ownership for what it is—an illusion.

The "Propertied" Working Class

Since the introduction of the G.I. Bill of Rights which arose out of World War II, nominal home-ownership among the American workers soared. Despite the astronomical heights to which the price of property rose since that conflict, it became possible for a G.I. to purchase a home with a down-payment which varied from nothing at all to a mere 5 per cent. of the selling price. The banks would put up a portion of the money and the Government through its Veterans' Administration would guarantee the rest of it.* Nor does the fact that the G.I. Bill does not extend its benefits to non-G.I.'s excepting in the case of the numerous instances of artificial transfer of such privileges by G.I.'s to others, exclude another large portion of the working-class from the ranks of home-owners. For in many cases at least a large part of a down-payment can be raised by the "buyer" by means of a second mortgage—in most cases a short term loan with a long rate of interest.

And so we find that a large percentage of the American working class has become and is becoming "owners" of real estate, even landlords. Just how little average equity the worker has in his home is another matter, however, which does not need too much research to unearth. First of all, we have the first mortgage. An article in the Boston Sunday Globe for June 10, '56 tells us that there is an "unprecedented debt of nearly \$90 billions on home

mortgages . . ." This mortgage debt, we are informed, "is being repaid by American families with remarkably low rates of fore-closures." Be this as it may, the picture looks something like this:

Let us say our worker buys a home for \$10,000 (a pretty shabby sort of deal at today's market) and that he gets his loan at 4½% interest. If he pays \$60.00 per month for principle and interest, it will take him 21 years and 11 months to pay off the loan.** But this is not the whole story by any means, for the city or town gets its cut and in most cases these taxes are added to the monthly payments making the total in this case more like \$80.00 per, rather than \$60.00, and which also means that the \$10,000 home has within the span of a typical 20-year mortgage, just about doubled itself in cost.

It never rains but it pours

"The course of true love never runs smooth," they tell us, nor for that matter is the course of a 20-year mortgage any smoother. A home, like its owners, does not get any younger as time goes on. In fact, figures show that almost 50% of them are at least as old if not older than the workers who buy them and in the years to follow there is much to be done in the way of repair. This section is not required reading for those workers who are able, after a hard day's labour at the shop or where have you, to repair or replace the roof, paint the sides, instal or repair the plumbing, heating equipment or electric wiring, build a fence, grow and trim a hedge, etc. This applies rather to the overwhelming majority of our fellow-worker homeowners who are too exhausted, or too inexperienced to do the work of a dozen craftsmen in their spare time. These make the grist for the Home Improvement mills with their "easy payment" plans backed by the Government's Federal Housing Authority or by various Home Improvement Plans sponsored by individual banks. These can tie them up for periods up to five years in amounts ranging up to \$2,500 plus interest. Providing, of course, one's credit still warrants such a loan. For those who have slipped and have fallen by the way-side, credit-wise, there are the second mortgage and other types of friendly finance companies which ask no more than an arm and a leg in return for the loan.

In the face of the continuing debt which confronts the worker "home-owner" in the years his mortgage has to run, fortunate indeed is the fellow who does not lose his status and revert to that of tenant in name as well as tenant in fact. In recent years there have been a fairly insignificant number of foreclosures—insignificant when compared with the vast increase in nominal home-ownership. According to the Statistical Abstract of the U.S. for 1955, pg. 457, estimated non-farm real estate foreclosures for continental U.S. ranged from 68,100 in 1926 to a high

of 252,000 in 1933 and a low of 10,453 in 1946. The figure for 1954 was 26,211.

This data was taken from approximately 1,400 counties, cities, townships, or other governmental divisions. It represents the number of properties acquired through foreclosure proceedings but *excludes* voluntary deeds of sale in lieu of foreclosures or defaults on real estate contracts. And this last item is by no means inconsiderable. Anyone who has engaged in the so-called art of salesmanship in the home improvement field has become cognizant of the fact that a not insignificant percentage of "home-owners" become delinquent in their mortgage payments or their payments on the roof, side wall or combination storm and screen windows, with the result that they are either foreclosed or jump clear with a few dollars in lieu of foreclosure.

That so-called Common Stake

The nominal home-ownership by American workers will no doubt continue and even to expand as time goes on. To a considerable extent and especially in the case of that large number of workers who "own" city tenements, they in effect act as rent-collectors and maintenance-men for the banks that hold the mortgage. It certainly works fine for the Capitalist class to have a working population, a large part of which has such a tangible stake in the nation as a real-estate deed even if the balance on the mortgages, the outstanding F.H.A.'s, attachments and liens just about obviate the title. Anything that adds to the feeling of a common bond between the workers and their masters is a wonderful thing—for the masters; especially when it costs them nothing. To the extent that such "ownership" exists the illusion helps to hold back worker class-consciousness. The working-class home-owner is less likely to favour strong action against his employers in a strike for example. His 20-year mortgage and his F.H.A. notes loom darkly before him and help influence his actions.

This sort of thing, however, can but help to hold back the tide. It can not prevent it from ultimately sweeping in to engulf the Capitalist system, to finally relegate it to the history of past societies. The vast majority of workers, even in America, may aspire to but will not be able to attain even the spurious type of home ownership we have been discussing. Capitalism is a system which provides real property ownership only for the Capitalist class.

HARMO.

* Last year 30% of all houses were bought with V. A. guaranteed private loans, although out of a total of 14.5 million G.I.'s of World War II more than 10 millions have taken advantage of this feature. (Nat'l Real Estate and Building Journal, May, 1956.)

** From a table published by "Changing Times" for February, 1956.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," September, 1906)

The Trades Union Congress

The so-called "Parliament of Labour" . . . will be larger than ever according to the statement of the Liberal M.P., who is secretary. The usual resolutions which have been moved every year are to be moved yet again; amid the usual clamour of self-advertisement. In point of futile resolutions and wasted words the Congress compares unfavourably with even the tower of babble at Westminster.

A Congress that is supposed to represent and express the aspirations of over a million and a half of working men should (it would seem) enunciate a definite and logical working class policy; it should break down the barriers between union and union and bring about the economic unity of the workers, and should be itself to the fore energetically and unequivocally battling for the interests of the toilers against the class who prey upon them. But the Congress does none of these things. It is rather in

the position of the poultry in William Morris's fables, who spent their time discussing with what sauce they should be eaten, and who sent in resolutions and deputations to the farmer's wife and the head poulterer regarding this vital question, but who were horrified at the revolutionary suggestion, of a battered looking and middle-aged barn-door cock, that he did not want to be eaten at all.

The aimless resolutions that are passed by the Congress in the intervals of junketing, the deputations and petitions that are sent to the class in power regarding the weight and shape of the shackles that are worn by the workers, the praise and advertisement that are given to the assembled delegates by the enemies of the working class, all demonstrate the uselessness and impotence of the Trade Union Congress. The reason for this impotence is, however, not difficult to find, and it illustrates the supreme importance of the work that we are doing—the propagation of the principles of scientific Socialism to the

workers who are within and without the trade unions. The Congress is impotent because the majority of the workers within the unions are as ignorant of their real interests and as blind to their historic mission as are those who are contemptuously dubbed "blacklegs." And the leaders of the blind—even those who see clearly—have in the main no desire to awaken their followers to their class position and rightful aim; they have little desire to break down sectional divisions and ignorant prejudice among the rank and file; for if the workers were brought together as a class upon the economic field, if the workers became aware of the meaning and importance of the class struggle, an consciously pursued their revolutionary aim of the conquest of political power and the democratic control of industry, why then many of the leaders would lose their soft jobs, and many would have to abandon once and for all their hope of attaining to the flesh pots in the gift of capitalism.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

Provincial Propaganda. Speakers have been visiting the provinces during July and August and it is hoped that good results will be reported from Manchester, Birmingham, Edinburgh and Nottingham. Bristol group has had success on Durdham Downs (a pre-war regular speaking spot). There has been difficulty over selling literature there but our comrades have taken the matter up in the local Press. Their letter has been published giving the full name of the Party. Meetings with audiences of 200-300 have been held.

Literature Sales. Comrades are still energetic on the various canvasses being organised by Ealing and Camberwell Branches. This work is particularly good as owing to the bad weather, our outdoor propaganda must have suffered and in consequence the sale of literature at meetings has not been as well as expected.

From Wellington, New Zealand, we have received news of the death of an old comrade, Con Killeen. The Overseas Secretary of the Wellington Branch writes: "He died in his sleep on the 9th April, 1956, aged 78 years. He was a member of the old New Zealand Marxian Association. Con could always be depended upon to help in



Party work, very seldom was he absent from E.C. meetings. He did not suffer a long illness. According to reports he was reading until 12 p.m. on the night he died."

From High Wycombe we also learn that Comrade Gibson died recently. Comrade Gibson had been a member since 1920, a speaker in his younger days, and although moving around, always joined his nearest branch. He will be particularly remembered by members of the old North London Branch.

P. H.

TRANQUILLIZERS

LIFE under modern capitalism gives rise to all sorts of anxieties, tensions and "complexes." To start with the securing and holding down of jobs in that "increasingly competitive world," which the politicians are constantly referring to and in the advent of automation.

The working class housing problem, keeping up with hire-purchase commitments, having relatives in Cyprus or other trouble spots; all these problems tend to produce various mental disorders.

No small proportion of people suffering as a result of society's contradictions join the steadily expanding ranks of the mentally ill as patients, voluntary and otherwise, in the mental hospitals and asylums.

There is also an increasing tendency to resort to

drugs, known as "tranquillizers" to temporarily oblivate the nagging problems. Taking sleeping pills for insomnia is nothing new of course, but these tranquillizers are a comparatively new phenomenon.

In the U.S.A. a commercial drug called Miltown (named after the town of its manufacture in New Jersey) is fourth largest selling drug in the country and, according to a *Daily Herald* article (18/6/56), is becoming a "dangerous national habit."

Again, according to the *Herald* there are two tranquillizers produced in Britain—reserpine and chlorpromazine, the former in some cases leading to suicidal depression.

What a commentary on present day society!

Surely it should be apparent that the very real problems which confront us are inseparable from capitalism.

In the world of harmony and co-operation that will be Socialism, the circumstances that give rise to worry and anxiety will be absent.

Where the very means of life, i.e., those of production and distribution, are commonly owned and democratically controlled, resulting in the replacement of the profit by the use motive, the constant fear of economic crises, of new industrial techniques, and the perpetual struggle, will be things of the past. Likewise the tragedies being enacted in Cyprus and Algeria, and the ever present threat of large

scale war arising from capitalism's struggle for markets, strategic bases, trade routes and spheres of influence.

Resorting to artificial antidotes in an attempt to momentarily oblivate our problems is worse than futile.

Their permanent solution, indeed the only solution to working class problems, is really self-evident, the emancipation of our class from the enslavement of capital.

Fellow workers, let us stop eternally trying to escape from society's ailments, but face them, understand them and based upon that Socialist understanding take the necessary political action.

F. S.

ANIMAL CRACKERS

IS psychology the bunk or am I afraid of what might turn up through delving into individuals minds? The answer depends on what psychology is and this I confess my inability to decide.

Whilst reading *Reynolds News* (8-4-56) I noticed an article headed "The 'Animal Crackers' Character Test" and sub-headed "Would You Rather Be A Fish?" This aroused immediate interest. As the article was written by Dr. Brian Welbeck, *Reynolds' News* crack psychologist (he is their only one), I anticipated a fount of information.

It appeared from the article that headmen who examine head cases find it important to determine the characters they are investigating. Incidentally, I have not got acquainted with how psychologists determine the subjects willingness and capacity to pay the bill for treatment. Neither do I know how they manage to keep this dark in view of the whole host of other characters, rent collectors, insurance agents, credit merchants, and so on, who are deeply interested in this facet of an individual's character.

Not only is it important to determine character but it should be done as simply as possible. This seems highly desirable as it cuts down work tremendously and expedites business no end. Happily this has been achieved; only two easy questions are necessary.

At this stage instructions appeared in the article. Personally I'm a guy who is always getting instructions, at school, at the Labour Exchange, in the Army, from the wife, in the factory. Indeed, it is difficult to mention where I don't get instructions. This made things very easy for me. This is what I had to do: "Before you read any further—stop." I did this! nothing happened. I proceed to the next word, "Look." This I am doing I know because I can see the word, still no reaction. The next word is "listen." This produced another blank. I try them all together simultaneously. This is difficult sitting in a chair with a paper in my hand. Still no dice. All this makes me aware of how really mysterious psychology is.

Next I have to write down my "own" answer to the two easy questions.

The Dr. sure appreciates the uncertain world we live in. Be careful. All of us are aware of the Secret Life of Walter Mitty. Some answer other than our own may inadvertently slip in. Make sure it's your own answer and not the Admiral's whom you don't happen to be.

The first question is: "If you had to be an animal which animal would you choose?" My answer came fast—a human. The second question was curt and terse, no

beating about the bush. "Why?" This shook my morale. Me being a wage slave, and not knowing any other animals that have, for example, dogs and wage slave dogs, I got no animals to look down on. I got out of that dilemma rapidly. I was cheating, picking the card I was not meant to choose. I tried again, "sabre toothed tiger." Why? Because its extinct, if it wasn't it would be very useful to chew up Capitalists with. This completes the test. Now follows the real hard work interpretation.

From a number of examples of interpretation provided I choose the first case at random that Dr. Welbeck recalls as a pale, plump, young woman. Her choice of animal was gazelle, and the reason is because they are very graceful with long beautiful legs. It transpires that this dame is very unhappy about her large cumbersome frame and wants desperately to be like Jane Russell or Marilyn Monroe. This is very shocking because I never knew that pale, plump, young women had large cumbersome frames, which goes to show how good a psychologist the Doctor is and *Reynolds News* is making no mistakes.

Now comes the interpretation of my own character. The first extinct animal that sprang to mind was a sabre toothed tiger. Immediately my mind projected on the nearest wall, the spectacle of the most ferocious tiger imaginable chasing bloated Capitalists in 78 carat gold limousines all over the place. This I can recommend as highly enjoyable to unhappy people like myself who are very desirous of becoming plain ordinary citizens of the world.

The real importance of my choice of animal is because it is extinct. One reason why animals become extinct is because they are separated from their sustenance. This is really what I would like to happen to the Capitalists. To see them deprived of their rent, interest, and profit, by the world's workers taking over the livelihood the means of wealth production and distribution and making this the property of everybody or nobody and thus making everyone plain citizens of the world.

This analysis reveals that I am a very frustrated character. This I shall remain until the workers of the world allow me to assist them in the performance of the delectable task of eliminating capitalism and establishing Socialism.

The characters reading this who are not acting as willing and able physicians in removing my frustration or in curing the social ailments of the world are altogether very deplorable.

D. W.

A NERVOUS BREAKDOWN?

QUITE recently this writer had a nervous breakdown. He was not alone. Many suffer from nervous breakdowns, anxiety-neurosis strain and the like. The stresses and strains of our present way of life are just too much for many of us.

At six or seven in the morning we are awakened by the continuous jarring of the alarm bell; after a hurried breakfast (if we have one; and many do not), we rush out of the house on to a crowded bus or even more crowded tube train—or both. In many cases before we even start work we feel exhausted and tired out. An hour on bus and tube train is enough for one day . . . but then the day has not really begun. We still have seven, eight or more hours in the office, in the shop, or at the factory bench; and then an hour on the bus and train again at night. . . .

Rush . . . rush . . . rush . . . day and night. And for what? For the worker, a wage or a salary; for the employer, profit.

Most of us rush our lives away; and yet we achieve very little. We come into the world with next to nothing, and go out in much the same condition!

This continual striving to "make ends meet" throughout our lives also contributes to nervous illnesses and breakdowns. Our wages and salaries never seem to

keep up with prices. There is never quite enough to go round. Should we blame the employer? Hardly. He does not employ us just to give us work; to make us happy; to give us money in order that we can buy everything we want. He employs us (to get to work at eight o'clock or nine) so that we, in co-operation with our mates, will make a profit for him. The more he can get out of us the better it is for him. And he is not particularly concerned, as an individual, if we do get tired on the tube train if we do have a job "making ends meet." or in most cases if we have a nervous breakdown—so long as we do not stay away from work too long. In most firms the real employer—the shareholder, the Capitalist—never sees us. He does not know us. He has his "problems" of profit; and yet more profit. That is the way our society goes round. It is the "dog eat dog" world of capitalism. It is the world that Socialists wish to replace by a different world—the world of Socialism. A world with a different basis; with a different motive—not of profit and the continual rush to "make ends meet." We want a world without nervous breakdowns, insecurity and anxiety. We are working (in our own small way) for such a world. Moreover, we would like you to work for one also. How about it?

"PEN."

HOLES—PARTICULAR AND GENERAL

EVAN was a cripple who looked after holes, or perhaps it would be truer to say he protected the public from holes. Before the war he had been a "digger of holes," but having lost a leg in a hole on the Normandy beach, the local council had taken him back as a "hole minder." During 25 years employment he had become thoroughly conversant with holes of various dimensions and purposes.

There had been occasions during a particularly lean period (due to Government economy) when there were no holes to hand out and Evan, divorced from a job, would complain bitterly. On such occasions he would say—when the Government was in a hole they pinched his. Of course, if he had given the matter more thought he would have realised that in work or out of it, holes and himself were inseparably bound together.

Like most specialists, Evan was an authority on the particular rather than the general. Taking any given hole, he could analyse it from a number of standpoints; its shape, cost, suitability, etc., etc., and more important than all, how long it was likely to remain (the "life" of a hole was especially important as his job depended on it). What he failed to see was the unending vista of "holes" with which society was riddled, each filled with countless millions of his class striving to clamber out of them. Evan was a strictly "practical" man not given to theorising and only concerned with the "immediate hole."

Having told you something of Evan's difficulties, perhaps it would be advantageous to consider the question of "holes" more closely. The term "hole" is, of course, widely used in popular parlance to describe "a condition of things," so that when people talk of being "in a hole" we know what they mean.

The trouble is, that usually, they don't know that the particular "hole" they have in mind is circumscribed by a much wider and deeper "hole"—Capitalist Society,

and that however much they strive, the workers never succeed in getting out of a "hole" permanently.

Holes, big and small, that exist everywhere in Capitalist Society, are called by Economists, Government officials, and such like "experts," "Crises" and no sooner is one filled in than another is created. Sometimes, despite the waste and time involved, crises do afford a short lived measure of sustenance for some but invariably it is at the expense of others. Eventually a "hole" comes along into which thousands tumble with wide spread ruin and loss of life such as when Capitalism goes to war.

And so we say, study the "hole" you are in together with the rest of society of which you are a part, get to understand the nature of "holes," "crises," and other impedimenta of Capitalism that frustrate, keeps you poor, and occasionally demands your life and limb. Having understood, take steps to fill them in. The tool for the job is waiting, it is labelled "Socialism."

W. BRAIN.

PERCY YOUNG died on the 12th of August, after being ill for a little while.

His name never appeared in the SOCIALIST STANDARD; he never spoke in public or wrote articles, or was an officer of a Branch. But he joined the Socialist Party in 1906, and with his death a link with the beginnings of the Socialist movement has been broken.

He was a brush-maker: not a factory operative, but a practitioner of a craft which has almost died. He made his brushes in the little shop off Walthamstow High Street and sold them on a stall in the market; on fine afternoons, with the shop door open, you could see him sitting with his twine and his can of pitch and watch his hands working with the deftness of a lifetime's use.

His father was a brush-maker too. His father belonged to the Social-Democratic Federation, from which the Party sprang; he had a shop in the High Street, and

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

- "THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).
- "PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).
- GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).
- "RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).
- RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).
- SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).
- WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).
- WEALDSTONE Station (Sunday morning).
- KENTON Station (Sunday morning).
- HAMMERSMITH—King Street. (SMITH'S (not W. H.) Newsagents.

"kept away custom" by having copies of "Justice" fastened to the window. And there were others in the family. Percy's brother, Byron, was a prolific outdoor speaker for Socialism—a Liberal candidate threatened to horsewhip him once—until he went to Australia in 1920.

He had seen many changes: the decline of his own craft, for example. Last Christmas he was given a copy of "The Day Is Coming," and sat reading it half the night because it describes Mile End Waste at the end of the 19th century—stalls, quack doctors, cheap merchandise and S.D.F. speakers. He remembered it: used to go there as a boy to help his father sell brushes.

There must be many who knew him by sight but never by name: a little bird-like man with a little white moustache, always with a cap which he raised when he spoke to a lady. He had known hard times, and was always concerned for others' welfare. He gave generously to Party funds whenever he could, and loved to listen to a Party speaker re-affirming the things he had held to and done his best for all his life. He had humour, too: a quiet mirthful chuckle which gave him an unexpected elf-like look.

We are sad that Percy has gone; he, like the times and the people with whom he was a link, will be remembered continually.

R. C.

YOUR STAKE IN SUEZ!

Speaker . . . E. WILMOTT

Chairman . . . T. FAHY

Meeting on Sunday, 16th September, 7.30 p.m.

at

DENISON HOUSE, 296, VAUXHALL BRIDGE ROAD
(near Victoria Station)

Admission free.

Questions and Discussion.



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ...	3.30—5 p.m. and 7—10 p.m.
East Street (Walworth) ...	Sept. 2nd 12.30 p.m.
" 9th	11 a.m.
" 16th	12.30 p.m.
" 23rd	11 a.m.
" 30th	12.30 p.m.
Whitstone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

MONDAYS

Heron Court, Richmond ... 8 p.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

Station Road, Ilford ... 8 p.m.

SATURDAYS

Jolly Butchers Hill ... 7.30 p.m.

(Nr. Wood Green Stn.)

Ealing Green ... 3.30 p.m.

Kinston, Castle Street ... 8 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39 Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh
OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165. 12th and 26th September.

OPEN DISCUSSION

on
Wednesday, 26th September, at 8 p.m.
at

PADDINGTON BRANCH
The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place (off Edgware Road,
adjacent to Marylebone Road)
"The Socialist Standard"
(A Review of the September issue)

EALING BRANCH SOCIAL

September 29th

at "The Viaduct Inn," Hanwell, W.7
(Buses 607 and 83 pass door)

7.30 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. Admission 2s.

Free Refreshments. Licensed Bar.

"In Aid of the Branch 'Socialist Standard' Fund

Correction

In the last sentence of the article "People's Capitalism" in the August issue "designation" was incorrectly printed "destination."
ED. COM.

TWO PAMPHLETS ON RUSSIA

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Its Origin and Outcome,"
(Published by the Socialist Party of Canada, obtainable from
S.P.G.B. 50 pages, 6d., post free 8d.)

"RUSSIA SINCE 1917," (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/3).

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
(6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Big Bull's Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. Sept. 6th and 20th.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Rectory Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, c/o 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (Sept. 5th and 19th) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, Sept. 10th and 24th at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to R. Russell, Secretary, 41, St. Vincent, Glasgow, C.3.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to O. James, 56, Weymouth Terrace, E.2.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (Sept. 12th and 26th) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, Sept. 11th, and 25th George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o. Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, S. Hills 1, Devonshire Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOD GREEN AND HORNSEY Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsey, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- * Canvass the S.S.
- * Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- * Submit names for sample copies.
- * Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- * Get libraries to display the S.S.
- * Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.
- * Deliver the S.S. to regular Subscribers in your area

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 626 Vol. 52 October, 1956

THIS MONEY BUSINESS

NOTES BY THE WAY

THE MOSCOW NEW LOOK

A PROPAGANDIST VISITS
BIRMINGHAM

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

4^D

The T.U.C.

What it is and What it Should be

IT IS NOT DIFFICULT for anyone who reflects dispassionately on the world situation to see broadly what the human race needs to solve its problems; an end to war and war preparations, an increase of the production of useful articles and services, and means to secure that these things are made available to all. Put in so general a form, these aims would be endorsed with more or less sincerity by members of all political parties all over the world; but there the cleavage begins. Non-Socialists, if they believe the ends practicable at all, think they can be won by modifications of the existing social order and by building up United Nations. Socialists hold that class and international conflict can only be ended by replacing Capitalism by Socialism and that until this is done neither the problem of achieving a large-scale increase of production of useful articles, nor the problem of distribution to all, can be solved; while Capitalism endures there will always be wars,

DOCUMENTARY FILMS

Every Sunday, 7.30 p.m. at H.Q., 52 Clapham High St., S.W.4

Starting 14th October. (see Notice on page 159)

and the workers will go on producing wealth not for themselves but for the Capitalist owners of the means of production and distribution, with accompanying waste of labour and materials on armaments and other Capitalist anti-social activities and with inevitable poverty for the many and riches for the few.

Where does the T.U.C. stand in this? It represents a large proportion of organised workers in Britain, is committed in theory to internationalism through its affiliation to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and vaguely approves of a new social order declared to be the aim of the Labour Party here and of similar parties in other lands.

How does it shape up to its responsibilities? Regrettably it does so very ill, as the recent Brighton conference shows; this despite the much overrated shift of attitude from half acceptance of some degree of "wage restraint" to a more or less definite repudiation. On every issue it dealt with effects not causes and this was as true of the "militants" as of those they condemned.

Certainly the organised workers should use what strength they have to press for higher wages but how far does this carry them? They have been doing this ever since there were trade unions and in so doing they tacitly accept Capitalism and the wages system. The limit of trade union pressure on the industrial field

is set by the state of trade. When trade declines or when the sales of Capitalist industries in one country are hit by competition from other countries, the ability of the trade unions to do more than fight rearguard actions disappears. How can motor workers fight for higher wages against employers who have less need for labour?

No delegate even thinks it worth mentioning that, as Marx pointed out, the only way out of this is that trade unions should recognise the need to aim at the abolition of the wages system. This means aiming for Socialism but among all those who pay lip-service to Socialism no one ever reminds T.U. C. conferences of it.

Conference gave its approval to "automation" while seeking safeguards for displaced workers and consultation between employers and trade unions, but nobody thought fit to raise the one vital issue that the new automation plants, like the old ones, are the private property of the Capitalist class, used for their profit not for the good of the community as a whole. The extent of the demand that the delegates considered they were entitled to make was, in the words of the Communist, Mr. Haxell, of the E.T.U., being ready to fight "and win some of the increase of productivity for the workers."—(*Manchester Guardian*, Sept. 5.)

Some delegates urged support for automation on the ground that if British industry did not adopt it, while industries in foreign countries did, British products would be priced out of world markets. Here was a chance, which the Conference did not take, of recalling that the international trade union movement ought to have as one of its functions united action to prevent employers playing off the workers in one country against those in others, to the detriment of the whole working class.

The resolution demanding the 40 hour week was an exhibition of unreality. True the trade unions ought to struggle for shorter hours but they have most of them long ceased to do so in any real sense. Before the war 47 hours were the typical working week in British industry. Now it is nominally 44 hours; but in fact, through widespread overtime working, average actual hours are longer than before the war. The only people who have actually reduced hours are the employers in those industries where falling sales have resulted in a compulsory shorter week with shorter pay.

The resolution against "wage restraint" showed muddled thinking and demagogic speeches at their worst. Socialists would have stated the Socialist case for the ending of Capitalism and with it the ending of the wages system. What conference did was to tie up wage restraint with an attack on the Tory Government because it had not played its part in controlling Capitalism—as if the workers were any better off when the Labour Government was in power trying vainly to improve Capitalism by "controlling it." Mr. Campbell, of the N.U.R., in what goes for a "fighting speech," slated the Tory Government for saying that "balance of payments" difficulties made wage restraint necessary and he received the applause of delegates by declaring that Tory policy had meant "to many working class households," "difficulties with their balance of payments."—(*Daily Telegraph*, September 6.). This is the veriest claptrap, for working class households have been faced with difficulties of making ends meet ever since there was a working class and just as much under Labour Government as now. Indeed the evidence shows that under the Labour Government the position happened to be rather worse. Official figures show that between 1947 and 1951 wage rates rose 22 per cent. while the cost of living outstripped wage

rates with a rise of 29 per cent. Since the Tories came in, helped by more resolute trade union pressure, that position has been reversed and now wage rates at 64 per cent. above 1947 are ahead of the cost of living at 56 per cent. This was recently pointed out by a Labour M.P. Mr. Crossman. Writing in the *Daily Mirror* (November 15, 1955), he admitted that but for the workers' acceptance of the Labour Government's "wage restraint" wages under the Labour Government could have been higher than they were. The workers failed, he wrote, to extort "the highest possible price for labour in a free market."

And in spite of his bold words on rejecting wage restraint Mr. Campbell went on to say that if the present government were to restore the controls used by the Labour Government "trade unionists might not be compelled to press for wage increases to meet the price increases forced upon us." He is prepared, in other words, to go back to the defeated trade union policy operated under the Labour Government.

Br. Cousins, who carried conference with him on the resolution, demanded that the Tory Government should go in for disarmament and thus save £750 million as an alternative to wage restraint.—(*Manchester Guardian*, September 6.). He also spoke for a Labour Government. It brought applause from delegates who seemingly forgot that it was the Labour Government who launched the £1,500 million a year rearmament programme and inaugurated the "wage restraint" policy.

But having thus attacked armament costs and having also resolved to press for a reduction in the length of military service below the two years fixed by the Labour Government Conference went on to pass a resolution on the Suez dispute which, while anti-war in tone, nevertheless committed Congress to support the use of force if it was approved by the United Nations. But war is no less war because carried out under United Nations auspices as the delegates should well know from the Korean conflict into which the Labour Government entered in 1950. Supporters of this resolution mistakenly argue that workers' jobs are involved and therefore trade unions must act, including giving support to war, if United Nations gives approval. Which brings us back to the total failure of the T.U.C. to envisage the urgent necessity of getting rid of the social system that causes wars.

After being in existence for threequarters of a century the T.U.C. is still going nowhere and offering no guidance to the workers about their vital interest.

H.

THE NEW SOURCE OF ENERGY

"In recent years physicists have found methods of producing radio-activity artificially.

Under suitable treatment many substances which are not in themselves radio-active, and which therefore do not disintegrate of their own accord, can be made to emit radio-active rays and particles whereby the atomic nucleus is transformed and finally destroyed. . . . A relatively small input of energy can lead to . . . the emission of much more energy than was put in . . . We have potentially at our disposal an almost unlimited store of energy which, suitably unleashed, can have a tremendous effect on our economy and civilisation.

Used for destructive purposes, it can wipe out the human race; used as a source of industrial power it can confer limitless benefits on mankind." (*Power*, Martin Ruhemann, D.Phil. Sigma Books.).

KRUSCHEV ON STALIN

NOW that we have read in full what Khrushchev has said about the late Russian dictator, one important point emerges—Khrushchev blames Stalin and the excesses of Stalinism. But nowhere does Khrushchev question the system itself. "Big Brother" made mistakes, but "1984" remains! To Khrushchev the system itself is "good"; and the system is—Socialism!

Although the Soviet Government allows only one political party—the Communist Party; although, even to-day, after Stalin's death, after Beria's death, there is still the secret police; although there is a powerful army, navy, and air force; although there are rich bureaucrats, trust directors and government bond holders, and on the other hand millions of peasants and ordinary workers living in poverty, all this—and much more—is still defended by the Khrushchevs, by the Communists in all lands, as "Socialism."

Whether Khrushchev and his fellow Communists in Russia and elsewhere are knaves or fools we know not: whether they really think that the Russian set-up has anything in common with the ideas of Socialism is difficult to say.

Since the time of the Russian Revolution in 1917 the Socialist Party has repeatedly stressed the fact that whatever did happen there Socialism was not a practical possibility. Firstly, Socialism can only come about on a world scale. Secondly, a majority of people must understand the implications of a Socialist society and be prepared to work for such a society when it's brought about; and thirdly, Socialism cannot be a workable alternative unless the means of production are enough to enable people to produce sufficient wealth for everyone's needs. None of these conditions could or did exist in Russia in 1917.

At the time of the Russian Revolution, Russia was a

backward semi-feudal state, ruled by an autocrat, the Czar, without any real democratic traditions. Under such conditions the emergence of another despot—Stalin—was almost inevitable. In order to force through the industrialisation of the Soviet Union at such a pace he was considered by the Communists, including the Khrushchevs, as absolutely necessary. The Khrushchevs and other Communists, who now condemn Stalin, were just as much a part of Stalinism as was Stalin himself.

The form of society that has emerged in Soviet Russia, despite its dictatorship—personal or collective—its slave camps, its mass murders, etc., is not so much removed from that of Britain or France or the United States. In Russia large numbers of workers are employed (by the State) for wages (paid monthly). Goods and services are not rendered just because they are needed, but, like elsewhere, for a profit. The peasants of Russia are exploited like the peasants of France or Spain. The workers of Russia are exploited just like the workers of Britain or America. The land, the factories, the means of transport, are not the property of the people but belong, again, as elsewhere, to a few. In Britain or the States we call it capitalism: a society of wage-labour and capital. In Russia the Communists call it "Socialism." But Socialists still call it Capitalism—State Capitalism.

Socialism would have none of the features of Stalinist or present-day Russia. Socialism will be a free society and democratic throughout. The means of living will belong to all. Secret police, dictatorship and the horrors of a coercive State will no longer be necessary. But such a society, we feel, is beyond the ken of Khrushchev; he can only blame Stalin, the very man he previously defended for so many years.

PETER E. NEWELL.

NOTES BY THE WAY

Do You Trust Colonel Nasser?

Much of the propaganda about the Suez dispute has been concerned with whether Colonel Nasser is to be trusted. Sir Anthony Eden says no; and the Colonel says he doesn't trust the Western Powers. Many of the Labourites who oppose the Government's policy affect to believe that British Capitalism can rest content with the Colonel's promise not to interfere with the unfettered passage of the Canal.

Which of them is right? The answer is that they are all wrong. History is littered with binding treaties which turned out to be scraps of paper; with treacheries and forsworn promises even when the signatories, at the time they pledged their word, had every intention of keeping it.

The truth is that where vital economic and military interests are concerned it is so easy for the party to the agreement, who finds it becoming an obstacle, to convince himself that altered circumstances justify him in repudiating his obligations. (There is a lot to be said for the attitude of those Quakers who, on moral grounds, refuse to pledge their future conduct lest this should happen).

It was British governments which occupied Egypt "temporarily" and stayed there for over half a century and

British governments which have not paid off the hundreds of millions of pounds they pledged themselves after her World War I to repay to America.

All governments, when they find it highly convenient to do so, and provided they can get away with it, break their promises. They do it, too, in home politics with election pledges and it is the height of simplicity or hypocrisy for Labour opponents of Eden to pretend that we all ought to trust one another. They are indeed "all honourable men," but does the Labour Party trust Eden when he makes election pledges? or does he trust them?

About that High Dam and American Cotton

It happens that Egyptian plans for a new dam on the Nile provide an example of how promises come to be broken. What sparked off the Suez dispute was the action of Mr. Dulles in suddenly withdrawing the promise he had made to supply millions of American dollars to help Egypt meet the estimated £120 million cost of the new high dam at Assuan. The excuse given by Dulles was that the American Government believed Egypt's own financial resources to be insufficient to meet the rest of the cost, particularly since Egypt had been mortgaging its resources

to buy costly arms from Russia. The British Government followed Dulles' lead in withdrawing an offer of aid.

But an American reader of the *Manchester Guardian*, writing from San Francisco, gives a different reason. Mr. Dulles' Republican Party, needs every vote it can in the forthcoming Presidential election, including the votes of American cotton growers, already worried about large unsold stocks of cotton. They do not like the idea of an Egyptian dam which will greatly extend the irrigated area on which Egyptian cotton can be grown and put on the world market in competition with American cotton. The San Francisco reader writes:—

"The reason given by Mr. Dulles for the last-minute refusal was that Egypt was not able to fulfil its part of the contract. Whether Egypt was able or not, I do not know, but the more likely reason is that the State Department heard protests from the cotton growers of Louisiana and Mississippi. This is the year of a Presidential election, and in election years American foreign policy is always uncertain."

(*Manchester Guardian*, 29/8/56.)

The same writer also dismissed any notion that Mr. Dulles has developed scruples about using force in international disputes, and that this explains his caution over Suez:—

"When American canal interests were endangered by a recent revolution in Guatemala, America acted not with caution, but with decision, and the revolt was quickly put down."

And what about Colonel Nasser's pretence that it is only the Western Powers whom he cannot trust and that the African Powers are full of mutual love and confidence? Does the Colonel trust his fellow religionists in the Sudan or his fellow Africans in Ethiopia? Not on your life! The Government of the Sudan does not like the Egyptian plan and can advance seemingly weighty technical reasons. They would prefer dams and irrigation schemes higher up the Nile and its tributaries, under a joint operation in which Ethiopia, Uganda, the Belgian Congo, would join with the Sudan and Egypt. But the Colonel does not trust them any more than British Capitalism trusts the Colonel. He fears quite reasonably, that if Egypt puts up a lot of money to build dams not inside Egyptian frontiers, his Sudanese brothers may be tempted to take advantage of it. Mr. C. L. Hartnoll, wrote on the subject in *The Arab World*, which is the organ of the Anglo-Arab Association and sympathetic to the Egyptian point of view, with the Egyptian Ambassador as one of its patrons. The article, written before the Suez dispute blew up, contains the following:—

"The most probable explanation of Egypt's insistence on the superior merits of the High Dam is, therefore, most probably a political one. No doubt she feels that if she has to put up the money anyway, she might as well have full control of the whole undertakings on Egyptian territory rather than disperse control by foreign engineers at various points in the Sudan, Ethiopia Uganda and the Belgian Congo. Strategically she has always felt at the mercy of any power controlling the upper waters of the Nile but at least at Asswan she would have the control in her own hands. Also, of course, the prestige value of the High Dam to the Revolution and its leaders is not without its attraction."

(*The Arab World*, July, 1956.)

For while Egyptian Capitalism masks its financial interests under a high falutin imperialist principle called "the natural unity of the Nile Valley," which includes the ambition of Egyptian control of territories all the way up the River, some of the equally ambitious Sudanese have dreams of achieving this "natural unity" at Egypt's expense.

The Sudanese do not like the idea of Nile control. vital to themselves, being in Egyptian hands at Assuan.

And the Colonel for his part may reasonably fear that if Egypt puts up money for dams higher up the Nile the Sudan or Ethiopia might "do a Nasser on him." This is what Capitalism does to human relations.

Unearthly Socialism

In Labour Party journals and on their platforms, lots of pens and voices are calling for means to recapture the "lost spirit of the movement." One lifelong supporter knows an unexpected direction in which to look. Writing in *The People* (April 8, 1956), Mr. Hannen Swaffer had this:—

"I am, in religion, a Spiritualist and a Socialist. To me both these words mean the same thing. By this I mean that I have learned from the Spirit world to understand something of the creative force which is behind all creation, and that, knowing it to be my duty to try to carry out, during my earth life, the furthering of that creative principle in this world, I can see only in the adoption of Socialist principles the means."

He went on to affirm his belief that "Spiritualism and



"Please Mr. Gaitskell—You're damping my spirits"

Socialism, when joined in the practice of the lives of all of us, will abolish all creedal differences, and all class and caste hatreds, join us all in one great human family. . . ."

We can accept that Mr. Swaffer assiduously plugs Spiritualism and mixes it in with his already muddled notions of Socialism because it is the thing he really believes it, but the same excuse cannot be made for the *Daily Herald's* recent addition of horoscopes to its columns. The worried workers, seeking respite from the daily harassments of the Welfare State, can now consult "Your Lucky Stars" as interpreted by Diana. Another recent addition to the horoscope Press is the *News Chronicle* ("Seeing Stars," with the help of Leon Petulengro).

If they change to the *Express*, the *Mail*, or the two morning picture papers, their needs are likewise cared for and almost all of the cheaper Sunday papers are in the heavenly swim. But why no horoscopes in the evening papers?

Before the war the Beaverbrook Press, high minded and with a loud banging of trumpets, announced that it would no longer pander to this "ignorant superstition";

but after a lapse of time the horoscopes crept back again.

The purpose, of course, is to whip up circulation and the publicity experts are clearly convinced that you can't get into the big circulation without horoscopes.

The Reverend Donald Soper on Nasser

Among his admirers the Reverend Donald Soper is credited with understanding Socialism and being a Socialist. A speech delivered by him at Caxton Hall on August 14th, 1956, shows how little there is in the claim (speech published in the *Arab News Letter* Arab Students Union, September, 1956).

On the superficial things such as the hypocrisy of the British Government; the failure of the Labour Party (of which he is a supporter) to see the real issues; the non-existence of the "international law" to which the Government appeals; and the failure of the Church to seek "peace on earth and goodwill among men," on these he was plausible enough, but when it came to putting a Socialist point of view he was silent. He had absolutely nothing to say about world-wide Capitalism and the forces that drive all the nations into conflict. The nearest he got to reality—and this was seeing symptoms instead of causes—was to see evil in the existence of "nation states." But his remedy for this is "world government" and United Nations; much as if to say that as banditry is bad let us hope that the bandits can unite into one central bandit and in the meantime let us make rules of conduct for the bandits. So he demanded that while these "nation states" endure "there must not be privileges for some and rejections of these privileges for others." In other words "Fair play for all the bandits."

He dwelt on the slums and poverty alongside great wealth in Cairo and, quite fairly, marked this up against the former British rulers of Egypt; but is he really so naive as to suppose that the ruling class behind dictator Nasser are taking the Canal for the sake of the Egyptian workers they exploit? Apparently he is that naive or had his tongue in his cheek, for he called on the Church to support Nasser.

"I want to say in the name of Christianity that this Nasser ought to be encouraged and not be repressed, because I believe the root of the matter in him is good, and because it is good, it is our business to evoke it by corresponding good, and not to repress it by threats of violence."

What evidence can Mr. Soper bring forward for his implication that when a home grown ruling class runs Capitalism itself after ousting foreigners that their aim is any less the perpetuation of exploitation and the resulting poverty of the masses? British Capitalism has been run by home-grown rulers (including years of the Labour Party that Soper supports) and it hasn't touched the class ownership of accumulated wealth. And Mr. Soper shouldn't have far to look in his own neighbourhood to find some of the million slum dwellings.

He ended his speech with a call to throw out the Tory Government. His solitary piece of lip service to what he supposes is Socialism, being a plea for the introduction of "a truly Socialist Government."

Embarrassed by his difficulty in fully endorsing the Labour Party he declared that "by the grace of God, even the Labour Party can become a Socialist Government"; which surely is hardly flattering to his God. Why must God (whose "will," incidentally Mr. Soper claimed that he knows!) have to act in this roundabout fashion? Why can't the "grace of God" turn the Tory Party into a "Socialist Government?" It shouldn't be any more difficult.

Of course Mr. Soper knows that "divine grace" isn't going to solve the problem. He also knows that delivering Socialist truths would help. What, then, is his excuse, as a self-styled Socialist, for not delivering them at that meeting?

Automation, 1830

The rich have always been able cheerfully and patiently to bear the hardship of the poor and urge them to be equally patient. We now have the politicians and economists telling the workers who may lose their jobs through "automation" to reflect that in the long run it will all be for the best, and anyway it is inevitable. In 1830 the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge published an *Address to the Labourers on the subject of Destroying Machinery*. Here is a typical passage:—

"It is undoubtedly true that all machinery which spares human labour, unavoidably, on its first invention and on beginning of its work, throws some persons out of the employment in which they had been engaged, and they must seek their means of support in some other way; this is the necessary consequence of the introduction into use of the most simple instrument, and of all improvements in art. But, on the whole, the public, and every individual in it, are in the end infinitely the gainers."

A caustic cartoon, also published in 1830, and believed to have been the work of the brother of the better-known Cruikshank, dealt with the unemployment caused by the incoming machinery as one of a series called "Living Made Easy." The "machines" it portrayed were "Charity tubes to convey the smell from the tables of the rich, for the benefit of poor operatives."

It showed humble bare-headed workers permitted by a liveried flunkey to stand over the open ends of iron tubes which conveyed the smell of food into the courtyard of some palatial mansion. It was "particularly recommended to the philanthropy of those who have made large fortunes by machinery."

Mr. Macmillan on Paper Pounds

In a speech on inflation in which he warned that if wage increases went on the Government might devalue the pound again as did the Labour Government in 1949. He asked the trade unions

"Do you want more paper money to handle or more goods and services to enjoy?"

(*Daily Mail*, August 30, 1956.)

This is indeed a classic example of the devil rebuking sin. It is not the trade unions but Mr. Macmillan and other Chancellors of the Exchequer who determine the amount of the note issue. And what is their record at setting the printing press at work making more and more paper money? In 1938 the amount in issue was £529 million and in 1945 £1,311 million. The Labour Government stepped it up to £1,383 million and the Tories since they came in in 1951 have added another £300 million, making the present total £1,662 million.

Not, of course, that it makes any material difference to the workers position under Capitalism. They were just as poor and just as much exploited in 1938 with pounds fewer and wages lower, as they are now with wages trebled and each pound buying about one third of what it then bought.

They Can't Afford a Holiday

The British Travel and Holidays Association in a survey of the holidays of Britain's population tell us that "about half the population of Britain took no holiday away from home in 1955. Of those who did travel, only 8 per cent. went abroad; 77 per cent. of the population

has never been outside Britain." (*Manchester Guardian*, August 31, 1956).

"Expense was given as the main reason why people stayed at home during their holidays."

What Nina did not say

Nina, the Russian athlete, who was alleged to have taken hats worth 32s. 11d., missed a fine opportunity by not appearing in court. Why did she not get up and tell the British workers that under Socialism in Russia you just go along and take what hats you need without this Capitalist nonsense of paying for them?

The answer, in case anyone is in doubt, is of course that there isn't any Socialism in Russia, the claim that there is being one of the lies of the Communists.

Mr. Nehru Again

In his attitude on the use of military force to crush the Naga independence movement in India Mr. Nehru gets more and more like Sir John Harding in Cyprus.

A Naga M.P. in the India Parliament made a long statement on the suppression of the Nagas.

"As a result of military operations, Mr. Keishang said, 2,000 people were forced to stay in the jungles. Most of the villages of the Mokukchang area had been burnt by the army, between 30 and 50 villages had been burnt in the Megkukchange area, and four-fifths of the villages in other areas had been burnt. He said that 397 Nagas had been

killed, and troops had also killed Dr. N. Haralu, a respected doctor of Kohima, who had been "hunted in the streets of Kohima and shot down."

"More than five hundred Nagas are in prison, including students and children aged between 1 and 13. The Army tries to terrorise the Nagas by carrying a naked corpse, bound hand and foot, through the streets of Kohima, and bodies are burnt in spite of the fact that the Nagas never burn bodies. Is this behaviour of the Government better than that shown by the Nagas? . . . The spirit of revenge will persist for generations, even if the Nagas are defeated." (*Manchester Guardian*, August 24, 1956.)

Mr. Keishang chided Mr. Nehru with failing to show at home the "spirit of peaceful negotiation" he is always recommending to other governments. But Mr. Nehru was not to be moved. He won't even discuss the matter.

"Mr. Nehru, winding up the debate, admitted that some mistakes had been made, but said that the attitude towards the Nagas had been human and not completely a military one. He repeated that the Government could not talk with the Nagas until they gave up their demand for an independent state."

"There is no question of prestige. India is far too big for her prestige to suffer in such dealings. We are not prepared to talk independence, and we demand that the Nagas must give up violence."

Mr. Nehru is another of the reformists to demonstrate that there aren't any different ways of running Capitalism.

H.

THE MOSCOW NEW LOOK

MORE light has been thrown on the methods of the Russian dictatorship by the recent "reinstatement" of various old guard Communists who were liquidated during the purges of the thirties.

In Hungary, for instance, Bela Kun, the leading figure of the pre-war Communist Party, has been posthumously restored to favour, and hailed as a revolutionary hero who fell foul of "the cult of the individual."

Tuominen, the former secretary of the Finnish Communist Party, has presented a hair-raising picture of what actually went on during those bloody days of the great purge. He describes, in an article in *Uusi Kuvaletti* (1) the actual Comintern meeting where Kun was exposed:—

"One such ominous meeting was convened in the Spring of 1937. Immediately the session began the chairman, Georgi Dimitrov, laconically announced that the case of Bela Kun would be discussed. It was to be presented by Manuisky, the liaison official between the Comintern and Stalin. Manuisky began reading from a document. After reading a couple of paragraphs, he asked: 'Does Citizen Bela Kun recognise this?'

"The word Manuisky used—'Citizen'—seemed to affect Bela Kun like an electric shock. The rest of us, too, except Dimitrov and Manuisky, were startled. When the word 'Citizen' had been substituted for 'Comrade' on this sort of occasion, it meant nothing less than a sentence of death. Horrified and pale, Bela Kun mumbled: 'Yes, I do. It is written by myself. It is a circular sent to Communists in Hungary.'

"Kun vainly tried to defend himself against the allegation that he had criticised Stalin and the Comintern: 'This is a vile conspiracy. I did not mean Comrade Stalin, but you, Manuisky, and Moskvin, who are secretaries and bad Bolsheviks. I do know that Stalin is a member of the presidium and Zhdanov and Yezhov members of the executive committee, but after all, they seldom attend meetings. They are good Bolsheviks, the best in the world, but you, Manuisky, you're no Bolshevik. Didn't Lenin even in exile call you a god-seeker?' This attack made Manuisky flush with anger. He, too, lost his temper. Trying to keep calm, he started in an ironical vein and said: 'Such a great leader as Citizen Bela Kun considers himself to be shouldn't waste

his ammunition on such a small bird as I. But Comrade Stalin is a big enough target even for him, and it's at Comrade Stalin that he aimed in this circular.'

"... We all sat there, silent and horrified, watching this great and strong popular leader fight for his life, and the sharp, poisonous attacks of his executioner. Nobody dared to speak, nobody could think of anything to say, for or against."

"As the fight was beginning to wane, Dimitrov tinkled the chairman's bell, declared the discussion closed, and announced that the case would be referred to a committee of three. Until the case had been fully cleared, Citizen Bela Kun was relieved of all duties in the Hungarian Communist Party and the Comintern. The session was over. Bela Kun was allowed to go, and as he left the hall two N.K.V.D. men took him away. Nothing more was heard of him, and his case was not discussed again at the Comintern meetings. Rumour had it that he had been shot."

It is interesting to note that Wilhelm Pieck, the East German Premier, and the Italian Communist leader, Togliatti, are mentioned by Tuominen as being present at this meeting. One can realise with what consummate hypocrisy Togliatti and other European Communists now condemn the evils wrought by Stalin's "personality cult," after acquiescing in, and being a party to these very evils for all the years of Stalin's lifetime.

The case of Kun is by no means unique. At the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the old Bolshevik leader, Anastas Mikoyan, resurrected two of the party leaders who disappeared during the great purge—Antonov-Ovsenko and Kossior. It is worth while to observe, however, that Kun and these two were not brought to trial, but merely "disappeared." The situation with regard to all those who were brought to trial and executed has not yet altered, and Khrushchev's continued denunciation of "Trotskyites, Bukharinites, bourgeois nationalists and other enemies of the people" is the mixture as before.

It is impossible to predict how far the Soviet Government will carry this "resurrection from the dead" policy,

but it seems unlikely that many of the thousands of prominent Bolsheviks who were purged, will be restored to a posthumous position of dignity. The favourable mention of Antonov-Ovsenko is particularly interesting, as he was one of the members of the 1917 Bolshevik Government (Council of People's Commissars) of whose 15 members only one survived the purge—no prizes for the correct answer! It is highly improbable that other members of this Council, which included Trotsky and Rykov, will ever be commiserated with by the powers-that-be as "innocent victims of the cult of the individual," as this would in effect deny everything that the Communists have been saying for years about the "truly democratic" nature of the Soviet Government.

Another revealing event is the publication of part of Lenin's so-called political testament. This is the document that the Trotskyists have been publicising for years, but until recently, the Communist party has always denounced it as a forgery. With the publication of that part of the document that criticises Stalin, however, the Communists have in effect admitted the authenticity of the rest of the testament, which singles out five people for praise—Piatakov, Bukharin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky. The only other person mentioned in the testament is Stalin, who comes in for a considerable amount of criticism and is said to be unfit for the post of General Secretary of the party. Ironically, enough, it is of course only Stalin who survived, the other five being executed or murdered.

Further criticism of Stalin at the 20th Congress came from A. M. Pankratova, the Soviet historian. She condemned Stalin's version of history for its "arbitrary handling of the facts," for "fostering the personality cult," and for "poorly reflecting . . . the activities of the Old Bolsheviks, the collaborators of Lenin." As has been pointed out, most of Lenin's collaborators were either shot, imprisoned or committed suicide, and this is certainly a "poor reflection" on somebody.

The apparent frankness of the 20th Congress in facing up to its problems is in reality just as spurious as the declarations and resolutions of the previous Congresses. When one looks at the record of the Soviet Communist Party Congresses, it can be seen that since the late 20's every resolution has been carried unanimously, and no one has spoken in opposition to a resolution. The 20th Congress is no exception. The statement by Mikoyan that "in the course of about 20 years we had in fact no collective leadership" doesn't really indicate any better state of

affairs than when he said at the 19th Congress (1952)—"At the present stage in world history and the history of our Motherland, it is unthinkable to live, build, fight, without thorough mastery of all the new concepts Comrade Stalin has contributed to the Marxist-Leninist science. . . . After the 19th Party Congress our party will go forward still more calmly and confidently to the victory of Communism, under the guidance of our leader and teacher, the brilliant architect of Communism, our beloved Comrade Stalin. Glory to the great Stalin!" (Stormy, prolonged applause. All rise.) (2).

It is also worthwhile to note that although the Party Congress is theoretically the democratic organ that determines the party, and eventually, government policy, there has been a strange neglect to hold Congresses at all, and in fact since 1925 the gaps between Congresses have become wider and wider. Although the Party Rules required that Congresses be held annually, the Congresses held since 1925 have been as follows:—1927; 1930; 1934; 1939; 1952 and 1956(3).

One is led to conclude from all this that the ferment in the Communist parties of the world with regard to "overcoming the cult of the individual" is so much hot air, and merely a display put on for the benefit of those who are anxious to see the Russian bureaucracy placed on a more stable footing. Indeed, it would not be unfair to say that all those former undoubted Communist party members are only having doubts now because Moscow tells them to.

In spite of all the reassuring speeches of Khrushchov, Bulganin and other Soviet leaders, in spite of all their barnstorming "goodwill" tours, and in spite of the alleged restoration of collective leadership, there is fundamentally nothing that has happened since Stalin's death that would lead an intelligent observer to draw the conclusion that shattering changes have been made in the Russian bureaucratic governmental system. The fact remains that a ruling class has been put in the saddle in Russia and the other so-called Communist countries and no amount of juggling with the reins of power or the substitution of one official by another will alter the fact that the Russian workers are fundamentally in the same position as their brother-workers everywhere else—the position of exploited wage-slaves.

A.W.I.

- 1.—*New Statesman & Nation*, September 1, 1956.
- 2.—*Pravda*, October 12, 1952.
- 3.—*Stalinist Russia*, T. Cliff, p. 97.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," October, 1906)

There were 121,979 persons in England and Wales certified as insane and under care on January 1st, 1906, being 2,150 in excess of the figures recorded on the corresponding day of 1905.

On January 1st, 1906, according to a Parliamentary paper issued by the Local Government Board, there were 926,741 paupers in England and Wales, equal to one in 37 of the population.

[The corresponding number of persons registered as of unsound mind on January 1, 1955, was 152,144, the increase since 1906 being rather less than proportionate to the increase of population.

In December, 1955, the number of persons receiving

weekly allowances from the National Assistance Board was 1,612,000. Including wives, young children and other dependents these assistance allowances "made provision in whole or in part for a total approaching two and a quarter million persons."—(*Report of National Assistance Board for 1955*, page 5).

These figures are not comparable with the 926,741 for 1906 because the 1906 figures relate to England and Wales only while the figure 1,612,000 relates also to Scotland and Northern Ireland. A more nearly comparable figure for 1906 is 1,124,421, given in the *16th Abstract of Labour Charities*, 1913, page 334, but that figure included Southern Ireland. The population covered by the 1906 figure was about 43 million compared with the present population of 51 million.]

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OCTOBER



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone: MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

THIS MONEY BUSINESS

SOCIALISTS do not hold that "money is the root of all evil. (And before knowledgeable readers rush for their pens to let us know that we have the quotation wrong, Socialists likewise do not hold that it is the love of money that is at fault.) What Socialists hold is that the root evil of the modern world is Capitalism, the social system based on private ownership of the means of production and distribution. Capitalism presupposes the existence of an owning class and of a working class, and the whole arrangement for producing goods and services for sale at a profit. Money is a necessary part of Capitalism. It is not the root, but a rank, festering jungle growth on the surface in which the world's population blindly gropes its way.

The way the Socialist views this jungle growth is quite unlike the way of the various non and anti-Socialists. This is an acid test and it separates the Socialist from all the others. When the Liberal or Tory believer in Capitalism says "Of course you can't do without money," he is at least talking a sort of sense, for what he means is that you can't have Capitalism without a money system. But the Socialist has no desire to keep Capitalism and knows very well that if you have Socialism you do not need and could not have a money system.

It is at this point that the Labourite and Communist joins the Liberal and Tory and echoes their jibe that nobody in his senses really believes in a world without money. Which just goes to show what a deplorable effect the Labour and Communist policy of running Capitalism has had on their ideas. Half a century ago not only Socialists but also the pioneers of the organisations that eventually produced the Labour and Communist parties were quite familiar with this proposition and felt no need to break into asinine guffaws about it. They knew then that this was an essential part of Socialism. Now their successors are deeply shocked by the suggestion, which comes to them out of their forgotten past as from another world. They have handled Capitalist problems so long that they are Capitalist-minded. Now

they line up with the open defenders of Capitalism to produce their muddled plans for dealing with dollar gaps, balance of trade deficits, inflation, direct and indirect taxation and all the rest of the rigmarole. And what a rigmarole it all is.

Let us ask them one question. When they say "you can't do without money," what is it they think they are doing with the money system. Anyone who wants a good laugh should go to any of the orthodox economic textbooks and read about the functions money is supposed to perform, or alternately go to any Labour or Communist electoral programme and compare their promises of what they would do with what they actually do when in office, here or in Russia. One of the jokes in the textbooks is that money is "universally acceptable." Apart from dollars and gold bullion there is hardly a currency in the world that meets this requirement. Or take the nearly universal swindle of the past quarter of a century prac-



"Money, money—nothing but money, damn it."

ticed on depositors in savings banks. Authority assures them, and they believe, that they will get their money back, with interest; in fact they get back depreciated currency which will buy far less than the amount originally deposited.

It isn't only Socialists who are critical of the ever more complex monetary and taxation systems. Money is supposed, according to the textbooks, to smooth the working of industry, promote greater production and in particular to facilitate efficient international exchange. Yet, what do we see? In America farmers have for years been paid money to increase production. Now the stuff has piled up into mountains of unsaleable surpluses while elsewhere in the world, and in America itself, are millions of undernourished people who cannot afford to buy it.

On this ponder the *Economist* (June 9, 1956):—

"Farmers will soon be ploughing growing crops back into the ground under Government auspices, something they have not done since 1933."

The American Government is now going to stifle production by paying farmers to take land out of the cultivation of cotton, maize, wheat, rice, tobacco and peanuts. But because the Bill could not be passed in time by Congress some of these crops are already growing and to get the money from the Government for not producing crops the farmers are being allowed to plough them in. Mr. John

O'Rourke, editor of the *Washington Daily News*, who is in this country, read about the English titled lady who was ejected from her farm for not producing enough crops (for which incidentally British farmers likewise receive government subsidies). So Mr. O'Rourke wrote to the *Daily Express* (June 11, 1956) suggesting that this crazy muddle could be straightened out by a trans-Atlantic switch; let the English lady lease her unproductive farm to an American who could then be paid for not having produced, and in return she could hire an over-productive American farm and be paid by the English Government for producing more. Would this be crazy? Surely, but not more so than the reality.

And in face of this, the empty-headed opponents of Socialism tell us that it would not work!

Now take a glance at two believers in Capitalism and see what they have to say about their money system. First, Mr. George Murray, who in the *Daily Mail* (February 20, 1956) had an article "Is Money Out of Date?"

"Between the wars Britain tried deflation as the remedy for her currency troubles. The result was that prices and wages fell. We had to drive such hard bargains with our overseas suppliers of food and raw materials that they could not afford to buy our goods. We had chronic unemployment. To-day we are hell-bent for inflation. The result of this is that the price of our goods is forced so high that our overseas customers still cannot afford to buy them, though they are much better supplied with money. And we have 'overfull' employment."

Mr. Murray, who, of course, does not really believe that money is "out of date," lamely ends with a plea for finding, somehow or other, some means to strike a balance: as if Capitalism ever did, or ever could provide price stability and an uninterrupted flow of production and sale.

Lastly, there is the witty and sometimes shrewd economist who is permitted by the *Sunday Times* to poke irreverent fun at our rulers and their financial antics, Mr. George Schwartz. In the issue for April 15, 1956, he discussed the popular but quite baseless belief that Chan-

cellors of the Exchequer are really able to master the monetary monster nominally under their control. Mr. Schwartz doesn't think that Mr. MacMillan even understands the simpler aspects of monetary policy such as the connection between the note issue and the price level; but even if he did, it is Schwartz's opinion that the whole thing is now hardly comprehensible or controllable. Here is a typical passage:—

"Who's in charge of it? I can tell you that right away. No one. Of course, Chancellors talk largely of operating switches and of pulling plugs as if they were in charge of a control panel that registered the pressure in every part of the kingdom, and the outside world as well. But it is nothing like that. A Chancellor to-day is confronted with a vast refuse heap of smouldering fiscal expedients that have piled up over the past fifty years. On Budget day he can only make elaborate flourishes and then deliver a few pokes at the accumulated rubbish. If he did any more it might come down on his head or burst into flames. At the end of this ritual the Chancellor mounts the pile for a peroration, and for the rest of the week there is a rattling of the lids of empty dustbins which passes for a debate."

Mr. Schwartz delivers many more blows at the monetary and fiscal system, and ends by demanding at once and just as a first instalment the instant abolition of purchase tax, entertainment tax and the distributed profits tax. But does Mr. Schwartz believe that this will be done? and if it were would it seriously diminish the monumental muddle? Capitalism is a mess, of which its monetary contortions are a symptom. There is no cure within Capitalism. There is even little chance that it will ever get back to the crude but less complicated monetary chaos of the 19th century. Socialism offers the only way out and by comparison its proposition that people of the world shall co-operate to produce what the world needs and provide free access to it, without ownership, sale or profit, is simplicity itself. And if you think it still sounds shocking in its simplicity, a little thought about it will soon rid it of its terrors for you.

YOUR HELP NEEDED

The purpose for which the S.P.G.B. publishes the SOCIALIST STANDARD and pamphlets is to bring the Socialist case to the attention of workers who so far do not know it. The cheaper the price the easier it is to sell and the aim has always been to keep prices as low as possible. But keeping the price of the SOCIALIST STANDARD at 4d. necessarily results in a heavy loss. Readers will have noticed that in order to save costs we recently reduced the quality of the paper. Even so the loss is running at well over £20 a month.

The best sort of help you can give us is to push up the circulation. If we sold more copies each copy would cost a little less than it does and the loss would be smaller.

The other help you can give is financial. You can give us donations to help cover the monthly deficit, and thus free our ordinary income to meet other propaganda expenditure.

At present we also need over £200 to reprint our pamphlet "The Socialist Party: its Principles and Policy," and to publish a collection of articles from the SOCIALIST STANDARD under the title "Socialist Comments." Other pamphlets are contemplated. If you want to help, send your donations to the Treasurer, E. Lake, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, Clapham, S.W.4. Postal orders, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

THE PASSING OF A FOUNDER MEMBER

WE regret to have to record that our old Comrade Hardcastle passed away on September 15 at the age of 93. He was one of the only two survivors of the group that founded the Socialist Party of Great Britain in 1904.

Comrade Hardcastle attended nearly all of the Party Conferences, and was present at the last one. He also attended many of the indoor and outdoor propaganda meetings, putting in a regular attendance at Clapham Common. During the last two years failing eyesight limited his attendance at evening meetings, as it was too much of a risk for him to travel far in the darkness. He was a lively, tough little man, who never lost his conviction of the ultimate success of the movement he helped to start on its journey.

In the last week of the illness that brought his life to a close his brain was still alert and he demanded news of all that was happening in the world at large—including the latest developments over Suez.

Although Comrade Hardcastle did not figure on the platform, or in literary columns, he was a staunch supporter of the Party, who did propaganda in his own way.

The final departure of a loyal old comrade is always a sad event; we send our sincere sympathy to his relatives and the expression of our own sorrow at losing him.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

AN attempt to form a Communist Party in 1847 failed partly on account of the defeat of working class aspirations during the European uprisings of 1848, shortly after the publication of the Communist Manifesto. Just over 20 years later, when working class militancy was reviving, another attempt was made. Though this one was wider and stronger in numbers, it was weaker in outlook and attracted support from groups which were not only antagonistic to each other but also had no real interest in Socialism—which was the fundamental concern of the Marxian founders of the new organisation. This organisation was the International Working Men's Association, subsequently known as the First International.

The First International was formed in 1864. Throughout its career of about ten years it suffered from numerous handicaps, the most important of which was the immaturity of the workers political understanding at the time. It had incompetent secretaries and badly written minutes; it was hampered by government persecution, including the seizing of important documents and the circulation of forged ones.

The ideas upon which the International was built were not new; many advanced workers were dissatisfied with their oppressive conditions and were groping for a way out. The breaking of strikes by the importation of workers from outside the country involved was one of the principal spurs to urge on the building up of an international organisation of workers.

Arising out of protest meetings relating to the suppression of a Polish Nationalist revolt, which were attended by workers from different countries, a meeting was held in September, 1864, in St. Martin's Hall, near Covent Garden. At this meeting a proposal to form an international association of workers was greeted with enthusiasm by French, German and English delegates. A proposal to form a Central Committee, with its seat in London, was carried, and a Provisional Committee was appointed to work out the details of the Association. Marx, who had been invited to attend the meeting, was nominated to the Provisional Committee and was subsequently a member of the Central Council—later the General Council.

The Provisional Committee consisted of Trade Union leaders, Owenites, Chartists, Nationalists, Proudhonists, and old members of the Communist League. The Provisional Committee appointed a sub-committee to prepare an address and draft rules. A number of addresses and drafts of rules were prepared and rejected. Finally Marx submitted an address and rules that after slight amendment, were accepted.

The address contained a vivid picture of industrial conditions in England at the time and statements that are as pertinent now as when they were written nearly 90 years ago. For instance:

"In all countries of Europe it has now become a truth demonstrable to every unprejudiced mind, and only denied by those whose interest it is to hedge other people in a fool's paradise, that no improvement of machinery, no appliance of science to production, no contrivances of communication, no new colonies, no emigration, no opening of markets, no free trade, nor all of these things put together, will do away with the miseries of the industrious masses; but that, on the present false base, every fresh development of the productive powers of labour must tend to deepen social contrasts and point social antagonisms."

"Yet the lords of land and the lords of capital will

always use their political privileges for the defence and perpetuation of their economical monopolies. So far from promoting, they will continue to lay every possible impediment in the way of the emancipation of labour . . . To conquer political power has, therefore, become the great duty of the working classes."

On the whole, however, the address did not come up to the standard of the Communist Manifesto. This was mainly due to the necessity of producing something that would meet with the approval of those who founded the International. As Marx put it, in a letter to Engels:

"It was very difficult to frame the theory so that our view should appear in a form acceptable from the present standpoint of the workers. It will take time before the reawakened movement allows the old boldness of speech."

There was little in the address that the average reformer would object to, and much that could be, and has been, misinterpreted. It contained weaknesses that brought trouble and disunion later.

Although the rules gave the Central Council an inordinate amount of power, the first five paragraphs of the preamble to the rules contain some of the best material of all. They were as follows:

"Considering:

"That the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves; that the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes means not a struggle for class privileges and monopolies, but for equal rights and duties and the abolition of all class rule;

"That the economical subjection of the man of labour to the monopolisers of the means of labour; that is, the sources of life, lies at the bottom of servitude in all its forms, of all social misery, mental degradation and political dependence;

"That the economical emancipation of the working classes is, therefore, the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means;

"That all efforts aiming at that great end have hitherto failed from the want of solidarity between the manifold divisions of labour in each country, and from the absence of a fraternal bond of union between the working classes of different countries.

"That the emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence, practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries."

Apart from the reference to "equal rights and duties" the above is a fair statement of the position, but few of those who signed it and joined the Association really understood it. All that most of them got out of it was an expression of the general feelings in the air at the time: condemnation of existing evils and the barriers to national independence; sympathy with the co-operative movement and the glorification of the working man as a person deserving consideration.

At the beginning the International was poorly provided with funds; there was no fixed subscription, each group being left to make what voluntary subscriptions it thought fit.

Adhesions to the International were not made nationally, but by isolated groups; such as a trade union, a political party, or a group of some kind organised for some particular object. In the course of time groups in different countries federated and formed their own central councils the Central Council in London taking the name of General Council as the supreme authority. These different Central Councils had a great deal of autonomy, and were at times at loggerheads with each other.

At first adhesions to the International were slow, coming mainly from England. Later it made considerable progress in Switzerland; then it gained the adherence of Belgian and French trade unions and representatives of Spain and the United States were elected to the General Council. Whilst working to gain support the General Council took an active part in strikes and demonstrations, and sent out addresses on various occasions. It also took part in the Reform agitation in England in 1865, demanding Universal Suffrage.

Arrangements had been made to hold the first Congress in Brussels in 1865, but the project had to be abandoned owing to Governmental prohibition. Instead of the Congress an informal conference was held in London to discuss a variety of subjects, amongst which was "The Muscovite danger to Europe and the re-establishment of a free and united Poland." Some of the subjects for discussion reflected the immaturity of the understanding of the delegates. There was a small delegation from Switzerland, France and Belgium; the rest were English delegates

or foreigners resident in London.

The informal conference was really only a preparation for the Congress that was to be held the following year at Geneva, and the same subjects came up for discussion again at Geneva.

As the International progressed on the Continent the German speaking portion of Switzerland became the organising centre for Germany and Austria, where political combination was prohibited, under the Genevese Central Committee. The French-Swiss section in Geneva became the organising centre for the Jura region and extensive portions of France. This latter section soon became a storm centre, the principal scene of the activities of the Anarchists and, eventually, to a great extent the tool of Bakunin. Italy began to show increasing interest but the activities of the anarchists there and the nationalist movement complicated the situation.

GILMAC.

(To be continued.)

A PROPAGANDIST VISITS BIRMINGHAM

EUSTON Station was congested on Saturday, August 11th with industrial workers returning to the Midlands, after the industrial fortnight's holiday. Workers seem condemned to doing everything "en masse," and it seems the accepted idea that a "holiday" means the mass transference of population (working class) all in the same two weeks.

The sight of hundreds of people carrying cases, all pushing their way through the same three feet wide gap of the "all important" ticket barrier was one that typified the absurdity of Capitalism. The train, which was late, was packed beyond cattle limitation with people standing in the single gangway right up to Northampton.

Due to late arrival and missing the Birmingham Comrades no meeting was held on Saturday night, but on Sunday an excellent meeting was held. Both a Birmingham speaker and the visiting London member addressed an audience of 100 for 2½ hours. At first the Bull Ring (the public meeting centre in Birmingham) is a difficult place to speak in unless one has had some experience of places in London like Beresford Square, Woolwich and Tower Hill; there is always quite a bit of noise going on, both from traffic and from street performers who also frequent the spot, but a more attentive audience is hard to imagine. The hecklers are few, the reception of the case for Socialism is excellent, and a fair hearing is demanded by the audience if anybody persistently interrupts. At this first meeting 13s. 8d. worth of literature was sold and a collection of 10s. taken up. As is usual, all forms of Capitalism and types of government, were attacked by our speakers with emphasis laid on the black record of the Labour Party in and out of office; and no sign of enthusiasm for that party came from the workers assembled. It was also not difficult to show the real pro-Capitalist (Russian variety) nature of the so-called Communist Party. It was found necessary to stress the difference between nationalisation and common ownership of the means of production, workers being more familiar with quack reforms of Capitalism than the abolition of the wages system as a solution to their problems.

Capitalism being what it is, always in the midst of one crisis or another, there was ample current material

to deal with in the strike at Austins, and the Suez Canal dispute. This latter thieves' quarrel was illustrated to advantage by the August SOCIALIST STANDARD quoting Eden as telling workers that their very existence depended on winning the "battle of inflation" only to find one month later that "our" canal is the thing on which our lives depend.

About half way through the meeting an opponent, who had been heckling, got up on our platform to state his case against us. This largely consisted of a complete misunderstanding of the Party's concept of equality (the gentleman being a Christian told us that "God did not make us equal") and the usual vague references to the un-Socialist constitution of "human nature."

On other days the Bull Ring alternates with meetings and selling stalls, but another good meeting was held at Monday lunch-time. On this occasion another Birmingham comrade spoke to good effect. On Wednesday, the most promising of all meetings so far, was stopped by heavy rain after three-quarters of an hour. An audience of 150 were listening to questions and answers but before they dispersed some literature was sold.

Meanwhile on Tuesday (a marketing day) a trip was made out to Austins at Longbridge, a vast assemblage of factories, work shops and offices, which take the best part of half an hour to walk round outside. There are entrances at varying intervals with Austin Police in attendance; most of the rest of the surrounding is iron fencing with a double strand of barbed wire on top. The main idea in going was to see about the possibilities of a lunch-hour meeting, but the arrangements for this on Thursday fell through once more because of rain. While out there, however, half past five came round, which is knocking off time for some Austin workers, and with the literature case at the ready efforts were made to sell SOCIALIST STANDARDS. These were not very successful, it being only the second day back after the strike and holiday spending. One outstandingly curious feature of the visit was that hundreds of men from the factories and women from the offices coming out from making cars were either riding bicycles or on foot, and extra 'buses are laid on to move the queues. But for the madness of Capitalism there was a wonderful way to

get rid of the reported 200,000 unsold cars, but then again, but for Capitalism such a contradiction would not have arisen.

In the evening on Thursday the visiting member went along to the Birmingham Branch meeting where, after usual branch business, an interesting discussion on present-day aspects of Trade Unionism was held.

On Friday, from 12.30 p.m. to 2.30 p.m. another good meeting was held in the Bull Ring. A Birmingham Comrade spoke again and in favourable weather 200 workers listened to our case. The following day being another Market Day, and the London members having been out to Stratford-on-Avon, the meeting did not start until 7.30 p.m., having to stop after 8 p.m. due to heavy rain.

The last meeting of the visit, on Sunday evening,

more than compensated for any set-backs. Starting at ten minutes past seven the meeting carried on till nearly 10 p.m. The audience was a good 200 strong and listened attentively to our speakers, 8s. 6d. worth of literature was sold, including some pamphlets (most who were interested had by this time bought the SOCIALIST STANDARD) and a collection of 5s. 8d. was taken up.

Looking back, the London member would say that the visit to Birmingham was successful and worthwhile: the support from Birmingham members, considering they have to work for a living, was excellent, and it is hoped that next year's return visit, which he is looking forward to, will be enjoyed as much.

H.B.

BUSINESS MEN WORRIED ABOUT FALL OF WORLD TRADE

"At a time when this country has to contend with conditions flowing from the credit squeeze and difficulties in the motor vehicle industry, it is not too pleasant to read that there is likely to be a reduction in the rate of growth of world trade this year. The United Nations' World Economic Survey for 1955 suggests that this decline will follow the reduced rate of expansion in demand and output in the industrial countries. This will affect countries dependent on exports for expansion of economic activity. The report finds that the economic record of the past few years is better than that of the ten years following World War I. There are several grounds for serious concern, however. The growth hitherto has been due only in

part to favourable long-term forces. It had been largely based on temporary or special factors, and some of these have been disappearing. It is properly suggested that one decade of prosperity affords no proof that the world has acquired permanent immunity against the business cycle, or that the national or international remedies in its medicine chests would prove sufficiently potent to cope with another outcropping of the disease. Having regard to the changing aspect of world markets, to the increasing tempo and strength of foreign competition and to the domestic difficulties in this country, there is, indeed, no assurance that the comparatively good time through which we have passed in recent years will be prolonged."—(*Birmingham Chamber of Commerce Journal*, August, 1956.)

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

The Autumn Delegate Meeting will be held on Saturday and Sunday, October 6th and 7th, at Head Office (52, Clapham High Street). The Saturday session commences at 2 p.m., and on Sunday at 11 o'clock.

Meeting on Suez. At short notice, owing to the topicality of the subject, another successful Sunday evening meeting was held at Denison House, Victoria, on September 16th. The audience numbered over 200 and many non-Party members were present. Comrade Wilmott was the speaker and Comrade Fahy was in the chair.

Swansea Branch have had some good meetings this summer. Comrade Young went down from London and addressed two meetings. The members are very pleased with the result and no doubt will continue their good work of getting letters in the local Press regarding the Party and Socialism.

Sunday Evenings at Head Office, October 14th is the starting date for lectures at Head Office, illustrated with films. For full details see elsewhere in this issue.

The Literature Circulating Committee are planning an October Sales Drive of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, and

details are given in this issue of meeting places for canvassing. If Comrades rally to these sales drives and increase the STANDARD sales, they are propagating Socialism and reducing the loss we now sustain on literature.

P. H.



CORRESPONDENCE

Glasgow, C.2, 22/8/56.

Sir,

In the SOCIALIST STANDARD for August your contributor F. Offord, says "At the conclusion of the Second World War when the Japanese capitulated to Russia their arms and ammunition and their control of Manchuria were handed over by Stalin, not to the Communists who had borne the brunt of the Chinese war against the Japanese, but to their mortal enemies the Nationalists."

These statements are not merely incorrect—they are the very reverse of the truth. When withdrawing from Manchuria, the Russians, instead of handing over Manchuria to Chiang Kai-shek, whose authority they had by treaty recognised, gave advance notice to the Communist forces who were able to take up positions before the Nationalists arrived. The Russians surrendered immense quantities of captured Japanese arms to the Chinese Communists and this was one of the principal factors in ensuring Mao Tse-tung's success.

Neither is it true, but the very opposite of the truth, to say that the Chinese Communists bore the brunt of the fighting against Japan. The Communists reserved as much of their strength as possible for the coming struggle for China while the Nationalist forces were exhausted by their long and terrible campaign against the Japanese. Lin Yutang did not exaggerate when he said, in 1945: "For every Japanese the Communists claim to have killed they have killed at least five Chinese; for every town they have captured from the Japanese, they have captured fifty towns from the Chinese."

The Communists directed their struggle mainly against their own countrymen and the immense aid which Russia gave them was a direct breach of the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship of August 1945 in which Stalin recognised the National Government as the central Government of China.

Yours faithfully,

H. W. HENDERSON.

REPLY TO MR. HENDERSON.

On Mr. Henderson's first main point that Russia surrendered to the Chinese Communists the arms and ammunition left by the Japanese in Manchuria and also

assisted with advice, he does not give proof of his assertion. As for the statements in the article, they are fully supported by the following quotations from the generally-recognised historian on China, Professor C. P. Fitzgerald, and quoted from his work "Revolution in China." "Late in the war, in 1945, Stalin could say to Harry Hopkins that he did not regard the Chinese Communists as a serious factor, and recognised only Chiang's Government as that of China. . . . It was this regime [that of Chiang Kai-shek] that the victorious powers recognised as the legitimate Government of China. The Communists were treated as dissident forces who should properly submit to the authority of Chiang Kai-shek. Their claim to share in the surrender of the Japanese, or to administer the provinces in which they had maintained resistance for eight years, was not accepted" (page 83). On page 86 is a description of how Chiang Kai-shek (the leader of the Nationalist Kuomintang Party) obtained "the surrender of the Japanese to the forces of the Kuomintang, not to those of the Communists."

As to which side bore the brunt of the fighting against Japan—on page 64 "Chiang devoted his time and his German-trained armies to fruitless campaigns against the Communist rebels in South China. Huge sums of money were wasted on these vain attacks, heavy losses of material, many casualties among the best trained troops. None of these troops were ever permitted to fight the Japanese. . . ." On page 77, ". . . the Communists, who had ten years of experience of guerrilla warfare behind them, could be sure of being able to keep the field, for years if need be, till they, and they alone, represented Chinese resistance." Again, on page 80, "The Nationalist Government, from the end of 1939, never made any further military effort to recover lost territory. . . . It did not engage to any serious extent in guerrilla warfare behind the Japanese lines. This task was left to the Communists. . . ." Incidentally it was the constant fight against the Japanese which the Communists maintained that was such an important factor in rallying the patriotic Chinese behind the Communist Party, and that, in turn, really was a factor which enabled the Communists eventually to conquer China.

F. OFFORD.

"BOOM-TIME"

"Under the conditions of accumulation supposed thus far, which conditions are those most favourable to the labourers, their relation of dependence upon capital takes on a form endurable, or, as Eden says, "easy and liberal." Instead of becoming more intensive with the growth of capital, this relation of dependence only becomes more extensive, i.e., the sphere of capital's exploitation and rule merely extends with its own dimensions and the number of its subjects. A larger part of their own surplus product, always increasing and continually transformed into additional capital, comes back to them in the shape of means of payment, so that they can extend the circle of their enjoyments, can make some addition to their consumption fund of clothes, furniture, etc., and

can lay by small reserve funds of money.

But just as little as better clothing, food, and treatment, and a larger Peculium,* do away with the exploitation of the slave, so little do they set aside that of the wage-worker.

A rise in the price of labour, as a consequence of accumulation of capital, only means, in fact, that the length and weight of the golden chain the wage-worker has already forged for himself, allow of a relaxation of the tension of it." (Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, chapter "The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation." Page 676. Kerr edition, 1921.)

* Peculium: pocket-money given to slave by master.

MAGIC AND SCIENCE

HOWEVER, so far as the schemes for controlling events by magic were concerned, men have learned from bitter experience that nature does not work in that way.

Things do not happen in the world as if at the bidding of capricious sprites, but in an orderly manner as if in deference to fixed laws which have to be obeyed.

Night follows day, the seasons pass in due succession from seedtime to harvest, the events of human and animal life form a regular routine. The discovery of this essential orderliness of nature marks the beginning of what we call science. Once men have reached the scientific stage of development, they realise that success in living does not depend upon coaxing or forcing nature to do what we want.

It depends upon understanding nature's laws, and in making use of them to serve human purposes. That is the principle underlying all the great inventions—steamships, airplanes, radio and so forth, which loom so large in the world today." (*The World of Copernicus*, by Angus Armitage, C.Sc. Mentor Book.)

AN INTERESTING PROPHECY

"I doubt not posterity will find many things that are now but rumours, verified into practical realities. It may be that, some ages hence, a voyage to the Southern tracts, yea, possibly to the moon, will not be more strange than to America. To them that come after us, it may be as ordinary to buy a pair of wings to fly to remotest regions, as now a pair of boots to ride a journey; and to confer at the distance of the Indies by sympathetic conveyances may be as usual in future times as by literary correspondence. The restoration of gray hairs to juvenility, and renewing the exhausted marrow, may at length be effected without miracle; and the turning of the now comparatively desert world into a Paradise may not improbably be effected from late agriculture." (Written in 1661 by Glanvill and quoted by Mumford in *The Golden Day*.)

MASS SUICIDE

Under the title "Do not willingly contribute to the mass suicide of the human race" the *Empire News* (24 June, 1956) had the following:

"The highest radioactive deposit in a single day from a thermo-nuclear weapon test was 100 microcuries a square mile at Milford and 25 at Harwell. Daily deposits at Harwell and Milford, however, are generally similar. Danger from these radioactive particles is very slight, say scientists. But one of the radioactive substances, known as strontium 90 may be deposited in grass which is cropped by animals. This gets into their bones and may cause cancer. So the experts warn: limit the number of atom tests. Fears that rainwater may be contaminated from the Monte Bello atom test have arisen in Queensland, Australia, and people have been warned not to drink it for a few days."—The above was taken from a news item, "Atom-Rain Tests."—(*Empire News*, 24.6.56.)

But such is the nature of capitalism; that even though the rival Governments know they may be instrumental in causing the "virtual suicide of the human race." They dare not let up; for fear of conceding an advantage to their rivals; yet they have the effrontery to call capitalism a civilised society! Why, by comparison with this, even the most senseless butchery in history seems like sanity. The human race may be virtually dying on its feet; and still the people do nothing about it; when will they get wise; and act on their own behalf instead of waiting and hoping for someone else to put the world right for them?

Workers of the world, put not your trust in leaders. Instead fashion the world the way you want it yourselves by organising for socialism; then you can rest secure in the knowledge that the only developments which will be undertaken will be those which will be of benefit to all. PHIL MELLOR.

HOUSING, SAVAGE AND CIVILISED

"In the savage state every family owns a shelter as good as the best, and sufficient for its coarser and simpler wants; but I think that I speak within bounds when I say that, though the birds of the air have their nests, and the foxes their holes, and the savages their wigwams, in modern civilized society not more than one half the families own a shelter. In the large towns and cities, where civilisation especially prevails, the number of those who own a shelter is a very small fraction of the whole. The rest pay an annual tax for this outside garment of all, become indispensable summer and winter, which would buy a village of Indian wigwams, but now helps to keep them poor as long as they live." Thoreau, *Walden*, page 25, World's Classics edition (written in 1854).

OCTOBER "S.S." DRIVE

LIST OF CANVASSES

All members are urged to assist

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 4th.		
(Meet) Shepherds Bush (Met. Station)	7.30 p.m.
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 7th.		
(Meet) Hackney Town Hall	11.00 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station	10.30 a.m.
Southend	10.00 a.m.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 8th.		
(Meet) Finsbury Park Station	8.00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10th.		
(Meet) Camberwell Green	8.00 p.m.
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 12th.		
(Meet) Hackney Town Hall	8.00 p.m.
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 14th.		
(Meet) Regal Cinema at Junction of Mare Street and Wells Street	11.00 a.m.
South Ealing Station	10.45 a.m.
Southend	10.00 a.m.
Manor House Station	10.30 a.m.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 15th.		
(Meet) Finsbury Park Station	8.00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17th.		
(Meet) Camberwell Green	8.00 p.m.
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19th.		
(Meet) Odeon, Hackney Road	8.00 p.m.
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 21st.		
(Meet) White Hart (Cuckoo Estate)	10.45 a.m.
Hackney Town Hall	11.00 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station	10.30 a.m.
Southend	10.00 a.m.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 22nd.		
(Meet) Finsbury Park Station	8.00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 24th.		
(Meet) Camberwell Green	8.00 p.m.
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 28th.		
(Meet) White Hart (Cuckoo Estate)	10.45 a.m.
Geffrye Museum, Kingsland Road, Hackney	11.00 a.m.
Finsbury Park Station	10.30 a.m.
Southend	10.00 a.m.
MONDAY, OCTOBER 29th.		
(Meet) Finsbury Park Station	8.00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 31st.		
(Meet) Camberwell Green	8.00 p.m.

Camberwell Branch will be undertaking additional canvasses to those listed, details from Branch Secretary. For fuller details of Southend Canvasses contact Southend BR. Secretary. (Further information from the "Central Literature Sales Committee", 52 Clapham High Street.)

DOCUMENTARY FILMS at HEAD OFFICE

Documentary Films followed by brief Socialist comments at H.Q.

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET, S.W.4.

(near Clapham North Tube Station)

Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.

The meeting is then open for questions and discussion which can be continued in the Social Room afterwards when light refreshments will be on sale. Visitors particularly welcome.

Oct. 14th "A Trip to Soviet Union"—H. YOUNG.

" 21st "Proud City"—R. AMBRIDGE.

" 28th "The Atomic Bomb—effects on personnel"—J. BRADLEY.

Nov. 4th "Paintings of Vereshagin"—E. KERSLEY.

" 11th "The City"—C. KILNER.

" 18th "Speed the Plough"—V. PHILLIPS.

PAMPHLETS

"Questions of the Day"	1/-	(Post free 1/2)
"The Socialist Party and War"	1/-	" " 1/2
"Russia Since 1917"	1/-	" " 1/2
"The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years"	1/-	" " 1/2
"The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis"	1/-	" " 1/2
"Socialism"	4d.	" " 6d.
"Socialism or Federal Union?"	4d.	" " 6d.
"The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy"	4d.	" " 6d.
"Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?"	4d.	" " 6d.
"Nationalisation or Socialism?"	6d.	" " 8d.

All obtainable from the Literature Committee, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ... 3.30—6 p.m. and 7—10 p.m.

East Street

(Walworth) ...	Oct. 7th	11 a.m.
"	14th	12.30 p.m.
"	21st	11 a.m.
"	28th	12.30 p.m.

Whitestone Pond

(Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning.

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

WEALDSTONE Station (Sunday morning).

KENTON Station (Sunday morning).

HAMMERSMITH—King Street. (SMITH'S (not W. H.) Newsagents.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)

BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.

DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.

EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh
OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MAJ 5165. 12th and 26th September.

NOTTINGHAM MEETING

at
CO-OP HALL, on
SUNDAY OCTOBER 7th, at 7 p.m.
Subject: "SUEZ"
Speaker: To be announced.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA BRANCH
LECTURES AND DISCUSSION

at
6, KEPPEL HOUSE, LUCAN PLACE, CHELSEA
THURSDAYS at 8 p.m.
October 4th "Automation"—E. HARDY.
" 11th "Growth of the American Labour
Movement"—A. IVEMEY.
" 18th "The Transition Period"—JOE
THOMAS (Workers' League).
" 25th Title to be announced—W. READ.
November 1st "The Puritans."

TWO PAMPHLETS ON RUSSIA

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Its Origin and Outcome,"
(Published by the Socialist Party of Canada, obtainable from
S.P.G.B. 50 pages, 6d., post free 8d.)

"RUSSIA SINCE 1917," (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/3).

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
(6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
(BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Big Bull's Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. Oct. 4th and 18th.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reeve Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles, Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, J. Keys, 6 Keppel House, Lucan Place, Chelsea, S.W.3.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (Oct. 3rd, 17th and 31st) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, Oct. 8th and 22nd at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to R. Russell, Secretary, 491, St. Vincent, Glasgow, C.3.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at the Co-op Hall, 197, Mare Street, E.8. Letters to O. James, 56, Weymouth Terrace, E.2.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (Oct. 10th and 24th) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, Oct. 9th, and 23rd George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec. M. G. Hopgood, 12, Douglas Road, Worsley, Near Manchester. Phone, Swinton 3827.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o. Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 47, Eastbourne Grove, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, S. Hills 1, Devonshire Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., St. Edmunds Runwell Road, Wickford, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOD GREEN AND HORNSEY Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- ★ Canvass the S.S.
- ★ Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- ★ Submit names for sample copies.
- ★ Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- ★ Get libraries to display the S.S.
- ★ Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.
- ★ Deliver the S.S. to regular Subscribers in your area

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 627 Vol. 52 November, 1956

THE LAST FIFTY YEARS IN RUSSIA

EDUCATION AND THE SOUTHERN NEGRO

THE MISPLACING OF MARX

THE SWINDLE OF NATIONALISATION

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

T.V. in Modern Life

LAMBASTING TELEVISION IS EASY. The only difficult thing, indeed, must be for the critics to produce fresh variants on the bitter, derisive comments which seem all that can be found to describe the offerings of man's latest marvel. The same things were said about the films thirty years ago (those same films, by the way, now being hailed by the U-mob as aesthetic masterpieces); and, as with films, one fact brushes aside all the invective. In America families look at television for an average of five and a half hours a day, and in Britain for over half that time. Television, whatever they say about it, has become established as part of modern social life.

Obviously that does not justify its banality. It is quite true that most television programmes are stupid, noisy, mediocre and pointless, and that they have become more so since "commercial" television began in this country. But why single out television? Are not most radio programmes stupid, clamorous,

PUBLIC DEBATE

At Fulham Town Hall, Monday, 19th November, at 7.45 p.m.

"WHICH PARTY FOR SOCIALISM?"

Independent Labour Party - Representative, F. Maitland.
Socialist Party of Great Britain - Representative, R. Coster.
Chairman, P. Sansom (Anarchist Group).

Admission Free.

All Welcome.

mediocre and pointless, too? And most films, novels, papers and plays? Bad as television may be, it has only followed the illuminated trails blazed by every other form of mass entertainment.

In fact, much of the sneering and jeering at television is not really aimed at television at all, but at the working class. Mr. Maurice Richardson, commenting on the *Backward Child's*—i.e., commercial television's—*Birthday* in the *Observer* a few weeks ago made merry with phrases like "slobbering cretin" and "the Ad-mass." Smart, easy stuff this; it would be equally easy, if less smart, for Mr. Richardson to observe the U-mob lapping up stuff just as poor and twice as nasty as television in practically any West End theatre or cabaret.

Television is the passive entertainment *par excellence*. Indeed, if there is anything it emphasises about present-day society, it is this: the second-handness of almost everything. The football spectator is often condemned as a passive watcher, getting satisfaction by proxy from the deeds of others, but he appears an active participant against the television-watcher—at least wrapping-up, going out of doors, meeting other men, arguing and letting off steam, while the viewer is as wholly non-participant as is possible to be.

4

That is only the least part of it, however. The awful, meretricious mimicry which a universal visual medium breeds has to be seen to be believed: unending imitations of imitations, until imitation is an end in itself. It applies to the artistes, of course, but they are only the focal point of the pattern. See the amateur talent contests—*Find the Singer*, *Opportunity Knocks*, and so on. The dreadful thing is not that the competitors can't sing. They aren't trying to. They compete only in effectively copying the looks, gestures and antics of the stereotyped professionals.

It is this, the standardization, the depreciating of originality, and the acceptance of prototypes for practically everything, that makes television set the seal on the trends of the last quarter-century's popular entertainment. The man in the armchair is the least noxious of its end-products. What matters much more is the man wearing other people's looks, copying other people's tricks, living by other people's judgments, and thinking other people's thoughts.

The differences between B.B.C. television and "commercial" resolve themselves mainly into the latter's flamboyance—like comparing the *Telegraph* with the *Daily Mirror*. Thus, A.T.V.'s news-readers are engaging and breezy, the B.B.C.'s staid; the B.B.C. children's hour is carefully "improving," while A.T.V. gives them gunplay and thunder. There is one other vital distinction, however. On A.T.V. they give things away; on B.B.C. they don't. The give-away programmes are on every evening. The prizes (modest in comparison with the American ones) include £2 a week for a year, two jackpots which rise to £1,000, and television sets *ad lib*.

The give-away programme is a reiteration of one of capitalism's oldest myths: that if you can't climb the tree, there are always windfalls. The excitement of the thought is heaped on for the viewers. "How does it feel to win £1,000? Viewers may be able to tell to-night, if the Treasure Trail reaches its thrilling climax," says the *T.V. Times* advertisement of *Double Your Money*. The 64,000 *Question*, in which the eventual prize is £3,000, is positively ghoulish—the contestant in a glass box, macabre music, close-ups of the audience in dramatic lighting to squeeze out the last vicarious thrill.


What are the social effects of all this? The most obvious one is a loss of sociability: people go out less and welcome callers less. A few years ago there was a good deal of inviting-in to watch the television, but that has fallen off as television ownership has spread. Other forms of entertainment and recreation have lost accordingly. More beer-drinking is done at home and less in the pubs; cinemas, which kept their end up until this year, are now reporting a serious decline. And round this writer's way the local vicar circularized the houses last Christmas, to apologize if his carol-singers disturbed the viewers.

With this increased insularity, more attention has probably been paid to homes themselves, in the way of decorating, furnishing, and so on. At first glance that may seem a good thing, but in fact it means acceptance of the individualizing and atomizing of society that has been going on for the last hundred years—the division of labour carried to the point where each man hardly knows his neighbour. Indeed, going back to the television programmes, one of their most remarkable features is the almost hypnotic appeal of seeing other people revealed: in their occupations, in loss of dignity, or, most incredible of all, in the guise of the Man Who Eats Razor

Blades or the Woman Who Got Stuck in the Bath.

The ownership of a television set means far more than mere entertainment, however. It holds implications of prestige, of status shown by conspicuous consumption. Seven or eight years ago the mere fact of owning one was enough; the man who said: "I watched a good play last night" was saying, unmistakably: "I've got a television." That has passed, and nowadays it isn't worth having an outdoor aerial. Prestige to-day involves having a better, brighter and (above all) bigger set: one with a seventeen- or twenty-inch screen, where you can get both programmes and don't have to turn out the light.

It is funny—and sad—this business of "living standards." One would imagine that having a good standard of living could mean only one thing: having plenty of good food, being adequately housed and clothed, having no debts to worry about, and being able to please one's self. Well, it doesn't. It connotes, in fact, not living at all, but possessing. The standard is seen as the rung one has reached on the acquisitive ladder. The lowest rung, below which there isn't a standard at all, is the radio set. Above it, roughly in ascending order, come the nine-inch television, the washing machine, the refrigerator, holidays abroad, the mortgage-bought house, the big television set, and, indisputably top, the motor-car.



There are endless other things, of course—clothing, children's schooling, the sounds which come out of the radiogram; they have to be endless or the game might stop, and it can't. The common conception is that for people to be getting any or all of these things means more and more money is, by the grace of industrial civilization, being pumped into working-class homes.

That can be tested. According to the *London and Cambridge Economic Service*, wages currently are 176 per cent. above their 1938 level. Prices are given as 154 per cent. above 1938. In other words, wages in relation to prices (and that is the only way wages can be assessed) are just 8 per cent. more than what they were in 1938. In concrete terms, at today's prices a man with £7 10s. a week is eleven shillings better off than he was before the war.

Where does the money for the television sets come from, then? Most are bought on hire-purchase or credit sale. The instalments can be anything from fifteen shillings a week upwards; in the case of a credit sale, when payment must be completed in nine months, they can be as high as three pounds a week. There are two answers. The first is earnings over and above wages—overtime and production bonuses; the second, that more wives go to

work than ever before. Cauter and Downham's investigation in Derby found that:

"The explanation of the ability of the lower-paid worker to buy a television set is suggested by the family size analysis. In fact, two-thirds of the owner-families where the chief wage-earner received £7 10s. a week or less had more than one wage-earner in the family."

(*The Communication of Ideas*, 1954).

The truth, then, is that the television sets, like the other working-class "luxuries," are paid for by men working longer hours, their wives going to work, and both of them going without other things. It may be a pity that sacrifices are made in such a cause, but that is a different matter. Perhaps a final word may be said about the economic aspect of it. It is a mistake to think that all this—expensive means of amusement coming into ordinary homes—is a modern wonder. Before television

or radio, literally every working-class home had a piano. The price of a piano thirty-five years ago was anything between thirty and seventy pounds; it was, in fact, a far greater luxury.

Don't write off television as another machine-age monstrosity. Potentially, it can do a lot for man; as an instrument of communication, information and amusement. Its failings are not inherent in the cathode-ray tube, but are in reality the failings of social life displayed in three dimensions on a small screen. An American critic described television as a device by which a man may sit in one room and observe the nonsense going on in another. As was said at the beginning, that sort of lambasting is easy and it misses the point—which is that the real nonsense is going on in the room where the man is sitting.

R. COSTER.

EDUCATION AND THE SOUTHERN NEGRO

SOME parts of the Southern States of America have recently been the scenes of intense anti-negro mob violence. This violence was part of resistance to the attempts by the American Government to integrate negro and white school children within the American system of education. One of the reasons given why the negro should be rejected is that he is "biologically inferior" to the white, and that integration of negro and white will ultimately create a general lowering of human standards, both biologically and socially. We of the Socialist Party do not accept these vicious assumptions. The question important to us is this: What is it about the biological make-up of the various branches of the human family that prevent it from living together in a universal harmony of mutual co-operation? The answer is nothing, and this is the principle that is a guide to Socialists on this issue.

It is now a little over two years since, in 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the segregation of negro and white students, within the American educational system, was unconstitutional. It is little over a year since the High Court ordered Federal District Judges to enforce this ruling "... with all deliberate speed." The Atlantic Edition of the *New York Sunday Times* (9th September) gives a State by State account of what has been accomplished toward the integration end since these decisions were made. Its message to those who claim such integration as an ideal, particularly when dealing with the States of "the deep south," is grim.

"Virginia.—There has been no integration in the State's public, elementary or high schools, nor is there likely to be any this year."

"North Carolina.—No negroes have entered the high or elementary schools of North Carolina."

"Georgia.—Relying upon legal safeguards enacted prior to and after the U.S. Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in the public schools, Georgians expect to operate their schools on the customary dual basis."

"Florida.—In Florida a record number of students have started back to school—all in completely segregated classrooms—without incident."

"Alabama.—There is no integration anywhere in Alabama's public schools, except at the college level."

"Mississippi.—Not a single negro student has been integrated in a white school."

"Louisiana.—Louisiana begins the school year with segregation still strictly enforced in all elementary and secondary schools."

In all these States, which include a total of 1,900,000 negro school children, resistance to integration is being organized at the highest civic levels.

In Texas, Arkansas, Delaware, Oklahoma, Kentucky, West Virginia and Tennessee, with a total of 550,000 negro school children a very casual interpretation has been placed on the directive "... all deliberate speed," although some measure of integration has been achieved. In no sense is the principle of integration completely accepted by appropriate State Boards of Education.

Border States, such as Columbia, Missouri and Maryland, which contain 250,000 negro school children, whose populations are less than 10 per cent. negro, are steering a definite course in the direction of integration. In a word, action on the Supreme Court's ruling, for the majority of America's southern States, is being resisted in one way or another.

Both negroes and whites have founded organizations to protect what they think are their best interests. Negroes have founded the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured Peoples, and throughout the south this organization has attempted, by court order of Federal law, to enforce the ruling. On the other side of the tragic rift the White Citizens' Councils exist solely as anti-negro bodies. Their doctrine is an irrational horror of "Jim Crow." Their hopes and desires probably amount to nothing more than the realisation of the sentiments expressed in the corrupt version of the song sung to the tune of John Brown's Body, "we're gonna hang a nigger from a sour apple tree." At all events, he should certainly be kept in his place.

This September began the new school term. In some border States of the south, where integration has been partial, some ambitious negro mothers packed their children off to schools which had formerly been exclusively white, and so were produced some explosive, very ugly situations. Clinton, Sturgis, Oliver Springs, Clay, and Mansfield were towns that received much publicity as scenes of mob violence.

Sturgis is a mining community of 2,500 in Kentucky. On Wednesday, the 5th September, nine negro students tried to register at the local high school. They were confronted by an angry mob. The *New York Sunday Times* (9th September) reported: "That night four units of the Kentucky National Guard moved into town: next day the guardsmen escorted the negro youths to school. A crowd of five hundred townspeople yelling for 'nigger blood,' tried to break through the ring of troops... As the negro youths left school Thursday the mob shouted: 'We'll get you niggers if it takes all year.' Friday the negroes did not go to school—several reported their parents had been threatened with loss of jobs unless they stayed home... But all across the south last week there were sporadic outbreaks—every day new demonstrations against desegregation were staged, and every night, in front of some southern schools, a cross was burned."

What are the motives behind the 1954 Supreme Court decision? In 1950, when President Eisenhower was president of Columbia University, he commissioned an enquiry into manpower wastage. The report of this enquiry was published in a book written by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, director of the enquiry, entitled "The Negro Potential." Reporting the results of this enquiry under the title "Waste of Human Resources," *The Manchester Guardian* (15th May, 1956) said: "America's 15,000,000 negroes are its single most under developed human resource, and they cannot reach their full potential usefulness until they are thoroughly integrated with the white population... The report said that if education for negroes was raised to the level of that now available for whites, the annual rate of negro high school and college graduates would be more than doubled... It said that the record of negro troops in the war (1939-45) was less good than that of white troops. It attributed the difference to the handicaps brought from civilian life by the negro soldiers and the fact that they were segregated. It said that records of Korea, where negroes were integrated, showed a marked improvement." Quoting the report itself, *The Manchester Guardian* further said: "Only when negro and white families can live together as neighbours, when negro children and white children can play together, study together, go to the same church—only then will the negro grow up properly prepared for his place in the world of work." (Our italics.)

The results of this enquiry, which are bound to have influenced the thinking of men in high administrative positions, should be noted in conjunction with other facts. The conference of Southern Governors held in Alabama in 1955, was told that in 1900 the south had only 9 per cent. of the nation's manufacturing facilities; now it has 25 per cent. In 1939 the south's industrial output amounted to 11,000 million dollars; in 1955 it reached 60,000 million dollars. In the next ten years the south expects to build 10,000 new factories.

What does all this mean? It means that in conditions of general boom, when the southern States are expanding their industries fairly rapidly, because of prejudice and segregation, the southern negro lacks the modern cultural equipment necessary to his efficiency as an American wage worker. It means that the vast mass of human material in the shape of the southern negro is not being exploited to its full capacity. The issue is not one involving any "forces of progress," and the *New York Sunday Times* (9th September) will only assist con-

fusion when it claims that the issue is "the right to learn." The real issue is that Capitalism, in its further development, in its further consolidation, is being fettered by the prejudices of local southern opinion.

What then is the role being played by the pro-integrationists and reformists in the south? The end to which they work is the integration and consolidation of the American working class as a stereotyped, regularised social grouping, efficient to the highest degree, regardless of colour, creed or clan. They seek to make all American workers the mass products themselves of a mass production technique, known as the American education system. This education is the cultural priming that the mentality of the modern wage worker presupposes. It is geared to the demands of industry. It accomplishes much more than a working knowledge of the three r's. It cultivates a nationalist sentiment, it inculcates the values and moral concepts that provide the solid ideological pillars supporting modern propertied society.

The word integration, within the context of this problem, is used narrowly to mean negro school children receiving the same education as white children within the same classroom. This may or may not be accomplished. What is certain is that capitalism cannot contain any truly integrative principle. Capitalism of necessity sets man against man in one way or another. Even if negro children did receive the same schooling as white children, it still would not make the process of education integrative, for the education system constantly selects and excludes. Its streams and channels are selective, and its examinations are designed to exclude rather than incorporate. The education that a child receives marks his handicap or his advantage in the race, which at the lowest level starts out from being a dustman's son and finishes ideally in being a bank manager, or perhaps even a doctor. But this is "success," and "success" comes only to the few. Education is one of the ladders by which it can be reached. At the bottom of the ladder is the broad thick base of "failures," but with selection and exclusion, the ladder is narrowed down until at its topmost pinnacle we find those for whom initiative was a virtue. They made the grade. The worker is in constant competition with the worker next to him, competing for places to live, competing to get food, competing to get jobs, and competing to hold them. Any truly integrated social situation would have to be outside this narrow individualistic competition. Only the society functioning along lines of mutual co-operation and meeting the real needs of man as a whole can be truly integrative.

One thing surely will frustrate the southern integrationist's hopes, and that is a slump or a margin of unemployed. With little point in taking up the negro labour slack, surely the fervour of the Government's bent on educational integration will be cooled, and events have taught us that in such a case we should expect an intensification of race hatred. Such events should teach the white worker that he is a victim not of any "black menace," but a victim of the indiscriminate vicissitudes of a system which is not concerned with his true human needs. The "black menace" problem for the white worker is a myth, just as the hope that educational integration under capitalism will bring the negro worker happiness is also a myth. In fact, with each other's help, they have a new world to win—Socialism.

P. K. L.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the "Socialist Standard," November, 1906)

The Russian Revolution

The other great nations of Europe have long ago burst asunder the feudal bonds on industry and commerce, and the few survivals are more picturesque than effective. The aristocracy, where it has been able to continue in existence, is merged into the plutocracy and forms one compact mass against the workers. Russia, however, lags behind; and her economic backwardness is reflected in her medieval system of government. Hence, in the other nations of Western Europe a straight fight is possible between the proletariat and the capitalist ruling class, whilst in Russia the rising capitalist class has yet its emancipation from autocracy to accomplish: so that, in contrast with practically the whole of civilised nations, the working class and the capitalist class in Russia have, in the abolition of Tsardom's tyranny, a step to go together. This historical circumstance, which is at once the strength and weakness of the Russian movement, distinguishes it from that of all capitalist countries.

No Socialist, therefore, can withhold his sympathy from the great struggle of the Russian people for the elements of political liberty, and all must heartily wish that the great barrier to economic and political progress, Tsardom, may be speedily broken down. It is satisfactory to note that, in the present communication from the International Socialist Bureau the idea (which was so common at an earlier period of the revolution, and which was proclaimed by many who called themselves Socialists) that out of the ruins of Tsarist Russia the Socialist Republic would arise, is absent; whilst the elements of

political liberty, the creation of a Constituent Assembly, or at most the inauguration of a Russian Republic, are taken for granted as the possible outcome of the present struggle. It has been insisted upon in these columns that the Socialist Republic cannot be the outcome of the defeat of the autocracy in Russia, because the economic elements are lacking or insufficiently developed. As Marx said: "No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and the new, higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have been matured in the womb of the old society." The industrial development of Russia is still in its infancy, and vigorous though the infant may be, the greater part of the empire is yet untrodden by it. It is indeed probable that whatever government succeeds that of the Tsar will be compelled, if only to appease the peasants—the bulk of the nation—to bring about the most reactionary state of things in which the land is split up among the peasants as their private property.

Let us then do all in our power to help our Socialist comrades in Russia in the hope that they will not be deceived as to the outcome of the present upheaval: in the hope, also, that they will sternly keep their separate identity and distinct aim, so that the Russian bourgeoisie State of to-morrow may find a militant class-organisation of Socialist workers leading the final struggle against the capitalist class, whose defeat must herald the Triumph of Humanity.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL—continued

THE first congress of the International was held at Geneva in 1866, and it ran into difficulties at its opening. Individual members, mainly Blanquist, insisted on sitting as delegates and voting, although they only represented themselves. The London Conference had laid down that only official delegates were to be allowed to sit and vote. After some heated argument the Blanquists were ejected. They were so infuriated by this treatment that they afterwards became steadfast opponents of the International.

The delegation at the Congress was as follows: Twenty-five sections of the International were represented by forty-five delegates. There were also eleven co-operative societies represented by fifteen delegates—another instance of the peculiar and loose form in which the International operated. The French had by far the largest delegation, and Proudhonist views soon began to cloud the discussions.

One factor that intruded upon and influenced the discussions was the effect of an economic crisis which had brought a general stagnation in commerce and industry and was coupled with a bad harvest that made bread prices high.

The French delegates proposed a schisme for a world-wide co-operative society; they were opposed to strikes and to the limitation of the working day to eight hours on grounds that are worth quoting as an example of the

weakness of Proudhonist objection to existing conditions:

"In the name of freedom of contract, it was improper for the International Assembly to interfere in the private relationship between employers and employed, except by giving advice when asked."

(quoted by Stekloff, page 69).

This amounted to a sweeping denial of the class struggle by people who had pledged their adherence to the principles and policy laid down in the inaugural address and the preamble to the rules—which were agreed to by the Congress.

A resolution was passed fixing the contributions of all members at 3d. per year. Fixing the contributions was easy, but collecting them was entirely different. Trifling though the amount was, money came in very tardily, and less than fifty pounds came into the funds during the whole of the following year; this in spite of the fact that the size and influence of the International grew rapidly.

On the whole the first Congress was little more than a sounding board for the various discordant voices. In the main, however, the attitude of the General Council was supported, which meant that the influence of Marx was paramount. The views expressed at the Congress, however, alarmed the French Government, which henceforth seized every document going through the post on which they could lay their hands, including a report of the Congress.

The activities of the International now began to get into the press of different countries, sometimes with favourable notices, as there was always a hope that the International might be something that could be used with advantage in the struggle between capitalists.

The next Congress was at Lausanne in 1867, and was monopolised by the Proudhonists. A resolution relating to war was passed which, after beginning with a statement involving the abolition of Capitalism as the only method of abolishing war, contradicted it by stating that the International was prepared to "share in any activities in which the League of Peace and Freedom may engage in order to achieve the abolition of standing armies and the maintenance of peace." Behind the objection to standing armies was an attempt to get round the obstacle they offered to attempts at successful insurrection; attempts that were never supported by the mass of the population, partly through fear, but mainly through lack of interest.

Another proposal at the Congress was that State railways, canals, mines and public services should be exploited, or administered, by workers' associations whose members should give their services at cost price, though what price the latter was did not emerge.

There were many other proposals and resolutions, including one on simplified spelling and another on a moral code for all peoples in harmony with morality, justice and virtue!

The Proudhonists again expressed themselves against strikes without calling forth much opposition, and induced Congress to pass a resolution advising trade unions to invest their funds in co-operative production societies.

The discussions showed that the participants had not made much progress in practical knowledge, and that differences in outlook were being swamped by the influence of Proudhonism, although Marx, who was mainly taken up with his work on *Capital* at the time, still dominated the proceedings of the General Council.

Gradually a position was being reached in which the General Council was at loggerheads with a large part of the membership. It was this that gave Bakunin his opportunity when he entered the International in 1869 and promptly set out to fight the policy of Marx, with the object of getting control of the Association.

The Brussels Congress in 1868 was attended by 99 delegates, an indication of the growing influence of the International. The large delegation was no evidence of clarity in outlook; it simply forced to the front the fundamental differences in outlook of antagonistic sections. In spite of the efforts of the General Council, Proudhonistic influence still dominated, although at that Congress the International first declared openly for Communism; that is, Communism as the word used to be understood, and

not the monstrosity that has come out of Russia.

Proposals were put forward recommending a strike against war; producers to gain possession of machines through the co-operative societies and the mutual credit system; and, also, the hoary old platitude that Justice should regulate the relations between national groups.

In September 1869 the Congress was held at Basle, and marked the first appearance of an American delegate. It also marked the beginning of the struggle with Bakunin (who had recently joined the Association) that finally broke up the International.

At this Congress Bakunin supported a resolution giving the General Council power to expel any section which acted in defiance of the principles of the International; and also a resolution in favour of the abolition of individual ownership of the soil. Both resolutions were carried.

A resolution was put forward to abolish the right of inheritance. Bakunin supported this on the ground that the right of inheritance had become the basis of the State and the Family. The Marxists replied that the laws of inheritance were not the cause, but the effect of the existing economical organisation. However, the resolution was carried, but it did not get the absolute majority (owing to a large body of abstentions) to make it a part of the policy of the Association.

Bakunin also opposed a resolution that involved working class participation in political action, on the ground that the capitalist state should be left to rot away and a workers' state be built within it, to be set up on its ruins.

There was a discussion on trade unionism in which the supporters of Bakunin introduced the syndicalist idea that trade unions represented the social and political organisations of the future, in which groups of producers would own the means of production in each industry; the mines for the miners, the railways for the railwaymen, etc.

In spite of all the efforts of the Marxists, the Basle Congress was a sweeping victory for Bakunin, which shook the International to its basis. This Congress ended the constructive side of the International's work; henceforth it became a battle ground for a bitter conflict between the Anarchists and the Marxists.

In the six years since its foundation the activities of the International had been considerable in many fields, and in the minds of the governments of the day it appeared to be more powerful than it really was. By 1870 it was recognised as a menace to the existing social order, and was treated as such. Members and groups were subjected to police surveillance and persecution; correspondence was opened and documents confiscated.

GILMAC.

(To be continued).

THE MISPLACING OF MARX

THE ruling class, through its defenders, have tried many methods over the years to kill the influence of his work, but, like a ghost, Marx continues to haunt them. In the early years he was ignored, but the penetration, power and pungency of his outlook compelled opponents to take notice of him. Then followed bitter attacks upon him and his views, but social development took the point out of these attacks and revealed the ignorance and malevolence of the attackers.

Since then Marx and his work has been approached from different angles, in the endeavour to remove the sting. He has been patronised on the plea that he was quite an energetic and fruitful thinker, but, alas, his theories were all wrong! That what he said was perhaps justified in his day, but times have changed. That his criticism of Capitalism was searching and true in his day, but Capitalism has completely changed since then. And so on. But it was no good. In spite of the claims

that his theories were all wrong, and that no reputable economist or historian accepted them, time has shown that Capitalism is still fundamentally the same old Capitalism, and quotations from his writings reveal that his criticisms, his theories, and his conclusions are as applicable today as they were when they were written long ago.

In an editorial in *The Times Literary Supplement* (21st September, 1956) there is another approach to the work of Marx. He has become respectable, but the sting has been removed.

The editorial is concerned with a new book on Marx by T. B. Bottomore and M. Maximilien Rabel. The editorial tells us:

"The purpose of the editors is to exhibit Marx as, first and foremost, not a philosopher or an economist, but a student of society, and to show how much in the modern development of social theories is due to the impetus derived from Marx."

The editorial then claims that Hegel was the root of Marxism: "Had Saint-Simon never written a line, the broad outlines of Marxism might still have been the same: without Hegel Marxism could not have existed." This sweeping statement is nonsense; it ignores the fact that all past thinkers and practical movements played important parts in what ultimately became the Marxian outlook. The philosophers, from Aristotle to Feuerbach; the pre-French Revolutionary writers who were lumped

together as the *Encyclopædists*; economists from Sir Wm. Petty to Ricardo, including Benjamin Franklin; and finally the *Utopian Socialists*, whose influence, in spite of the editorial, may have been the most important in shaping the direction of Marx's outlook.

The editorial then goes on:

"Once this reservation [relating to Hegel's influence] is made, however, the case for Marx's influence on the development of sociological thinking is overwhelmingly made out."

This is a clever way of putting it; not that he was right in his outlook, but that he had a great influence in the development of modern thinking—but they refrain from enlightening us on the subject of modern thinking.

The real kick, however, is contained in the last few lines of the editorial:

"And it is possible to pay tribute to Marx's role in the formation of modern social theory without necessarily subscribing to all his conclusions. Few of the leading sociologists of the last fifty years have in fact been Marxists. But the study of society would not have attained the stature, or assumed the form, which it has reached to-day without the many-sided insights which Marx brought to it."

There we have it! He was not a bad old chap; did a lot of good work in his time, but, of course, we have progressed far beyond him now! Thus he can be safely canonised and forgotten.

But the devil of it is "He's dead, but he won't lie down!" GILMAC.


HOW A RUSSIAN FACTORY IS RUN

TO those people who think that the status of the Soviet worker is different from that of his British counterpart, or that the motive for production in the Soviet Union is not the same as in capitalist Britain, a recent article in the *Soviet Weekly* should dispel any illusions.

A certain Mr. Mick Akerman, chairman of the Finsbury Area Committee of the National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers, asked the *Soviet Weekly* the question: "How is a Soviet clothing factory run?" And in the *Soviet Weekly* of September 20th, 1956, V. Segalov answered him. In his reply Segalov shows that, despite the fact that Russia is supposed to be a "Socialist" country, its factories are run on good, sound capitalist lines. Segalov gives as his example "The Red Seamstress" clothing factory.

The Director

In the early days of the Soviet regime, in many factories the workers, through their "workers' committees" or Soviets, appointed not only their foremen, but also their managers and directors. Even on ships of the Soviet Mercantile Marine the captain often took orders from the committee elected by the ship's company. But within six months of the Revolution Lenin decreed that there must be in every case a manager appointed by, and responsible to, the appropriate organ of the government. Still, for a long time the "workers' committees" in the factories retained a large measure of control. To-day the picture is a different one. As Segalov says: "The factory is managed by a director appointed by the Minister"; much in the same way as is done in nationalised industries elsewhere. The director's duty, in a Soviet factory, is to fulfil the government's production plan and to make the most effective use of the machinery and materials allocated to him.



The article by Segalov continues:

"He has complete control of the factory he is managing. He is the responsible head, and his orders are obligatory for the whole staff. He has two managerial assistants—the chief engineer and the assistant of business transactions."

But the director is not quite a dictator, for his factory, like all other Soviet industrial enterprises, has a Production Council.

Production Councils and Workers' Participation

The Production Council at the "Red Seamstress" factory is composed of seventeen people, chosen by the director from the engineers, technicians and foremen, and

(Continued on page 169)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

NOVEMBER



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

THE LAST FIFTY YEARS IN RUSSIA

ELSEWHERE in this issue we reproduce extracts from an unsigned article: "The Russian Revolution," which, fifty years ago, in November 1906, placed on record the attitude of the S.P.G.B. to events in Russia. In 1904 war had broken out between Japan and Russia over Korea, which then, as today, attracted greedy investors and speculators in the neighbouring countries, and had great importance as a war base. Russia suffered a shattering defeat at the hands of Japan, and this gave impetus to movements demanding political and economic reforms. The capitalists wanted to get rid of the Tsarist autocracy, which hampered their development; workers wanted higher wages; peasants wanted land reforms, and all were able to unite in demanding parliamentary government based on a democratic franchise. Frightened by the wave of strikes, mutinies and riots, the government at first gave way and the Tsar agreed to set up a Duma (parliament); with legislative authority, not merely a consultative body, as had earlier been the limit of concession. But before long, helped on by the lack of unity and purpose in the ranks of the opposition, the Tsar's government regained confidence and dissolved the Duma. It was while this counter-offensive of the Tsar's government was in full flood that the article "The Russian Revolution" appeared in our columns, the occasion being the issue, by the International Socialist Bureau, of an appeal on behalf of the Russian workers.

The line taken by the article is for the most part shown by the published extracts, a line that the S.P.G.B. continued to hold when, in 1917, defeat in another war produced more movements of revolt in Russia, though this time they were successful in their aim of removing the Tsarist regime. The victory was to be shortlived, because within months the various movements that had been associated in overthrowing the Tsar and establishing a provisional government were themselves overthrown by the Communist Party, which has held power ever since.

Subsequent events have completely justified the declaration made in 1905 (and repeated in 1917) that the outcome of the struggle in Russia could not at that time be Socialism, but only capitalism: what has happened has proved the correctness of the S.P.G.B.'s Marxist approach. Although there are people who know so little about Russian conditions or about Socialist principles that they can still believe that there is Socialism in Russia, serious students have never been deceived; and even the popular impression of Russia held in Western Europe now more or less clearly recognises that it is not a social system better than Western capitalism, but actually worse, because of its dictatorship.

It is an ironical reflection that the anticipation of fifty years ago, that removing Tsarist autocracy would immediately open the way to a democratic republic, should have proved so wrong that it is only now that the "flight from Stalin" promises at least some prospect of progress in that direction. As far as elementary rights of organisation, publication, voting, etc., are concerned, Russian workers might still be living under the Tsars. In 1906 the government of Emperor Nicholas II. dissolved the not very democratically elected Duma, but it remained for the Communist government in 1918 to suppress permanently the first freely elected Constituent Assembly and thereafter forbid all political organisations except the Communist Party.

Along with political reaction has gone the repudiation of early Communist Party ideas about equality, a path along which the British Labour Party has also moved.

But while Russia has, as we forecast in 1905, not produced Socialism, it has built up the modern industries which make it a formidable capitalist, military and industrial Power, second only to U.S.A.

Another saddening reflection prompted by similarity between 1906 and 1956, is that knowledge of and contact with Russian workers is as difficult now as it was then. The *Socialist Standard* had to admit in 1906 to a lack of information about events in Russia, and this is still true: we do not know to what extent groups of workers in Russia have been able, despite the dictatorship, to keep alive their belief in the ultimate victory of Socialism against all its enemies and false friends in the so-called Communist and Labour Parties.

ADDRESSES OF COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA, P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Australia.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, P.O. Box 115, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND, Dublin, Eire.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND, P.O. Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, 11, Faneuil Hall Square, Boston, Mass, U.S.A.

The *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, *WESTERN SOCIALIST* and other Socialist literature can be obtained from the above.

Continued from page 167

is headed by the chief engineer. Its main function is to examine technical problems, the introduction of new technology and mechanisation—and suggestions made by ordinary workers in the factory! And, says Segalov, "On the basis of the council's recommendations the director makes a final decision in each case." The factory has three shops, each headed by a shop superintendent, who bears full responsibility for the fulfilment of the quota of goods that his shop must turn out during a given month.

The factory works in two shifts. Each shift in the main shops is headed by a chief foreman, and the foremen heading the different teams of between 25 and 40 workers are subordinate to their chief shift foreman.

"Before each shift the foreman holds a five-minute conference with his or her team, at which the workers are told about the day's quotas and production processes which should be the object of particular care."

And if you think that the running of a Soviet factory is completely undemocratic, you are wrong. For the *Soviet Weekly* tells us that:

"The workers also have a say: they ask for clarifications or make their own suggestions." (1).

They also participate in regular production meetings arranged by the factory trade union committee in all shops. The object of these meetings is to get the workers to increase their productivity, and thereby to increase the profits.

Profits in the Soviet Factory

For those who think that the basis of production in the Soviet Union is a Socialist one—that is, produc-

tion solely to satisfy human needs—be surprised to hear that "Profits make up an important factor in the production plan." And:

"Naturally," writes Segalov, "the greater the economy in the consumption of textiles, the higher the labour efficiency, the better the management of the enterprise, the lower will be the production costs of each item and the higher the profits."

Part of the profits are turned over to the state budget and the balance remains at the manager's disposal. "Out of the share of profits earmarked for the factory in 1955, many of the best workers and officials received bonuses." The article also tells us that the management paid for the accommodation of 400 workers in health and holiday centres—but does not tell us what proportion of the staff received these benefits.

The Function of the Trade Unions

Every year a collective agreement is negotiated between the management and the trade union. The draft agreement is discussed in the shops.

"After the draft has been discussed the factory trade union committee examines jointly with the management all the proposals made by the staff, and they draw up the final text, which is signed by the director and the chairman of the trade union committee."

But, of course, if the trade union or the workers themselves are not satisfied with the agreement, they cannot legally call a strike. Except for this, life in a Soviet factory is very much the same as it is in Britain or any other avowedly capitalist country, and has nothing in common with the administration of a factory—or anything else—in a Socialist society.

PETER E. NEWELL.

THE SWINDLE OF NATIONALISATION

(Address at a meeting held by Swansea Branch)

Comrades,

The subject for to-night's consideration has been selected by the Branch with some thought as one of the most important questions of the day, particularly in this area of the Coal and Steel industries.

For many years before the 1950 Labour Government, the idea was widely held that if the Government took over an industry, then progress would be made to some future ideal.

This was evidently the case with trade unionists, as resolutions passed at many Trade Union Congresses show. The notion was abroad that by removing the often objectionable or notorious exploiters and replacing them by Government officials or managers, some improvement in the workers' position would result. This idea can only occur to those ignorant of the wages system; coal miners or steel smelters still work for wages, whether paid by the Government or private employers.

Wage-labour remains the basis of production. Wages are the price of labour power, which is the stuff a worker sells to an employer—his energy. This stuff has a value corresponding to the cost (in hours) of production. Who pays wages? Those who own wealth. Who receives wages? Those who must work to live. When are wages paid? ONLY when the sale of the work they buy results in profit. Therefore, nationalised industries, run on wages, have to show a profit, just like "private" capital.

The next point is this: if some receive wages, others must pay them. Who can pay wages? Those who own wealth. They can employ others. These employers are

owners of wealth, so that wages must mean classes, rich and poor—workers and idlers, or, as the Principles of the Socialist Party declare, society is divided into two classes, one class possessing—the other producing.

By being owners these people are also rulers, they conserve their ownership by consent and force, if necessary. That is, in a world based on private ownership and profit, the owners dominate the Government. They are the real power behind the State.

We are told that today we have a "Welfare State"; "welfare" or not, it remains a "State." What is a State? No better definition has been given than Marx's own: "It is the executive committee of the capitalist class." Please note that; the capitalist class as a whole.

The State is the machine of power which arose when conflicts between owners, or groups of owners, threatened the existence of organised society itself.

From the days of the ancient Greek City Republics and Imperial Rome, to Napoleonic France and Stalin's Russia, this political machinery has been used to feather the nests of exploiters at the expense of the labourer. Sometimes it was a committee, sometimes a group, often a personal dictator, a Cæsar, a Cromwell, a Bismarck, a Lenin, or a Hitler.

These "personal" States—whether of Persian kings of antiquity or rabble-rousers like Tito, are usually the most rabid and ruthless "Nationalisers" of all.

And the reason is obvious. The State exists to further the interests of the owners, not only by stopping one group of capitalists from reducing society to ashes, but also by providing services of value to capitalists'

businesses. Therefore, all those branches of industry which are of vital concern to most capitalists are the target of the Nationalisers. Bismarck nationalised the German railways to get troops quickly to the French frontiers. Napoleon covered France with "Routes Nationales" to get armies on their way. Attlee nationalised coal mines to provide British capitalists with raw material. The Post Office, Docks, Electricity, Cables and Wireless occupy first places.

Some people claim that even if all this is true, it is still possible for the workers, fed up with private employers, to alter the position by Nationalisation in a democratic country. If the manager or director were replaced by trade union officials they think that these officials would then be subject to their control. This is nonsense.

The workers who wish to do this do not understand enough about the wages system. Workers cannot control wages—they can only abolish them.

Not understanding this, those workers vote for the Labour Party, which is committed to the maintenance of capitalism.

Nationalised concerns are expected to show a profit—they can only be capitalist. Whoever signs the order to close the pit is of little real consequence. What is important is the group the order is issued for—the capitalist; it is the same in Russian factories, or German railways, in Swiss electricity or the American postal service.

The nationalised industries must make profits for Bond holders instead of Shareholders.

Before the workers had undergone many years bitter experience of nationalisation, parties like the Labour Party (and also Lord Beaverbrook) made great play with some rubbish they called "public control of finance." They included demands for the "Nationalisation" of the Bank of England in their election addresses and rashly promised to curb the wicked financiers. The actual nationalisation of the Bank of England has turned out to be as little momentous for the British worker as the question of which group of capitalists control the Suez Canal.

Actually the Bank of England always has been controlled by Act of Parliament, and the investors who owned its capital. These investors had to satisfy the customers (the joint stock banks or Big Five). The Bank was always and still is the Government banker.

When today the Treasury raises (borrows) money by issuing Treasury bills, it must pay interest on the loans. When an investor buys Government bonds he receives interest which can only come from profit made by exploiting the workers.

When the Labour Government "socialised" the Bank of England, they bought out (compensated) the owners whose stock paid 12 per cent., by declaring a guaranteed rate of 3 per cent. interest, and paying £4 for a £1 share, so that the former owners still got their 12 per cent.

The payment of interest by nationalised concerns can only come from profit, it must be capitalism.

The demand for nationalisation, therefore, is not a demand for Socialism at all; but strong Capitalism.

Under Socialism—a system of society based on common ownership, there will be NO wages, classes, money, armies or State, but freedom, equality.

What then, would the Socialist say when faced with the widespread growth of nationalised capitalism in all countries, spreading now to India and China.


This is the normal development of Capitalism, which concentrates in fewer hands. The biggest hand is the State. Let it be so. We can no more stop it than stop uranium turning to lead. In Frederick Engels words: "The modern State, no matter what its form, is essentially a capitalist machine, the State of the capitalists, the ideal personification of the total national capital. The more it proceeds to the taking over of the productive forces, the more does it actually become the national capitalist, the more citizens does it exploit. The workers remain wage-workers. The capitalist relation is not done away with. It is rather brought to a head. But brought to a head—it topples over."

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific.

The solution is Socialism.

In the discussion which followed the question was raised as to whether, in spite of being still run by wage-labour, the South Wales coalfield had not improved working conditions under the Coal Board.

In answer to this, the chairman of the meeting cited the case of the pits at Gwaun-cae-Gurwen, where the



whole population of the village had been threatened with destitution due to the Board's decision to close the pit if output did not increase.

A special group of the strongest men had been picked and told that the decision depended on them. They went down, ignored safety precautions, went without meal times, slept in their pit clothes, and slogged away. They were then told "Not good enough" and given two more weeks by the Board. Finally the Board agreed to keep the pit open for a further trial period. It was questionable whether the South Wales miner had ever been reduced to such a position in the past, with miners' officials egging them on and the local parson thanking God for the "miracle."

The question of distribution without the payment of wages was raised, and the possibility of abuse of free consumption under Socialism.

A local resident from Loughor (Swansea) pointed out that fifty years ago there were no water mains there. When water pipes were laid, it was true that for a time people left taps running and took more water than they needed, but they "soon grew out of it."

The meeting also dealt with some anarchist objections to political action.

HORATIO.

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

WITH all the usual brass-bands and ballyhoo, the Labour Party has emerged triumphantly from the Blackpool Conference with what they fondly describe as a policy "towards equality."

As always, the usual hallmarks of futility and chicanery were apparent. The pious but embarrassing resolutions of some of the constituency parties were turned down on the solemn recommendation of the Executive; the "safe" composite resolutions blessed by the Executive were ushered through (both with the aid of the Trade Union block vote), and once again the Labour Party, under the expert guidance of Mr. Gaitskell, sallies forth to meet all comers.

When all the shouting has died down, however, what is it that remains? Nothing but a pitiful collection of woolly and sometimes well-meaning resolutions, that signify nothing as far as actual practice is concerned, and a document called "Towards Equality," which purports, in Mr. Harold Wilson's words, "to set the ideals of the Socialist pioneers against the framework of the 1956 society."

One would be at a loss to understand why a spirit of optimism pervaded the conference by merely looking at the resolutions passed and the policy statements adopted. What is really behind the optimism is, of course, that the Tories have struck a bad patch, and this in itself is sufficient for the Labour Party to entertain hopes of winning the next election.

So far as actual policy is concerned, a brief comparison of the attitudes of the Conference with the Labour Party's actual record will amply demonstrate the emptiness of their claims.

Perhaps the most blatant example of the Labour Party's hypocrisy over policy—and here it must regretfully be said that this hypocrisy is not confined to the leadership, but extends to the rank and file, too—was the attitude of the Conference to rearmament and conscription. There was the inevitable resolution that conscription be abolished as soon as the next Labour Government takes office, but this was turned down at the earnest request of the Executive, who stated that they should not be committed to the immediate abolition of conscription, but that they would dispose of this thorn in the side of the electorate in easy stages. And this from the party that extended conscription from 18 months to 2 years and instituted the biggest peace-time rearmament programme in this country's history!

Mr. Frank Allaun, M.P., who supported the resolution to abolish conscription, stressed the obvious when he said that "National Service is becoming a national curse, and if delegates doubt this they should ask the conscripts and their parents, teachers and employers. The knowledge that at 18 they will be taken from their homes and jobs is unsettling the whole of the 15-year-old school leavers, and when they are called up they find that two years of their lives are wasted. It is utterly immoral to send boys of 18, who are not permitted to vote, to kill or be killed, not to defend freedom in this country, but to deny freedom to people in other lands." All very true, but what has this to do with the Labour Party—a party that is committed to protect British capitalist interests when in power.

Another subject on which glib and pious resolu-

tions were passed was colonial policy, particularly with regard to Cyprus and Kenya. One resolution stated that Cyprus should be given self-determination, and condemned the Tory Government's policy, and another called for a commission of enquiry to investigate the brutal punishments imposed on non-Europeans in Kenya.

Here again, it must be pointed out that the Labour Party's policy has in the past completely conflicted with their avowed ideals. As far as colonial policy goes, during the years 1945-51 they carried out a policy that hardly differed at all from the policies of Liberal and Tory Governments before and since. One has only to think of Malaya, Palestine and Seretse Khama to appreciate the hollowness of the Labour Party's fine-sounding phrases, and it is fairly obvious that here too they have, when in office, followed the lines that one would expect from a party administering capitalism.

The example of Palestine is one that immediately springs to mind when considering the way in which the Labour Party, because of the pressure of world capitalist politics, has been forced to do something quite contrary to their prior declared intentions. At the 1945 Conference, Hugh Dalton, on behalf of the Executive, stated: "It is morally wrong and politically indefensible to impose obstacles to the entry into Palestine now of Jews who desire to go there . . . we should facilitate this going by the provision of economic assistance in various forms for the development of the Land of Promise and Hope in a world which, for the Jews, has been blackened to an extent which none of us who are not Jews can begin to understand or appreciate." Not long after this, Britons, Israelis and Arabs were slaughtering each other.

Another dead and decayed horse that was further flogged at the Conference was the old story about the Labour Party getting together with the leaders of Russia and their allies and coming to some amicable settlement over disarmament. It is well known that the memory of the electorate is short, but surely the Labour Party cannot imagine that it is that short. It is only a few weeks since the fiasco of Khrushchov and Bulganin's dinner with the Parliamentary Labour Party, and one recalls the bitter aftermath of similar pronouncements in 1945, such as Dalton's "Given that Anglo-Soviet relations are still clouded from time to time by suspicion and misunderstanding, I most emphatically hold that a British Labour Government is far more likely to remove these suspicions than a British Tory Government," which was followed by the Cold War and the somewhat hotter wars in Malaya, Korea, and elsewhere.

These examples can be multiplied over every sphere of the Labour Party's policy, whether it be pensions, housing, nationalisation, rent restriction, or anything else. The real tragedy is that in spite of the contradictions that riddle the Labour Party's policy and history, and in spite of workers' disillusionment during six years of Labour rule, the majority of the electorate will once again register their votes for capitalism—either the Labour or Tory variety.

What is basic to the whole question is this: The Labour Party is a party that intends to administer capitalism when in power, and to administer it in the only way possible—that is, in the interests of the ruling class. For all their fine phrases about equality and opportunity, they

have nothing more to recommend them to workers than the Tory or Liberal parties. Mr. Gaitskell himself let the cat out of the bag when he said: "It is not true that we want exact equality. Provided there is a decent minimum wage, we don't object to a system of rewards related to the nature of the work." (*News Chronicle*, 4th Oct., 1956). This in itself adequately demonstrates the point that the Labour Party is no champion of the working class, and, in fact, is a more efficient oppressor than the Tories. Remember the wage freeze, or the rise in the cost of living between 1945 to 1951?

The Labour Party has certainly a lot to answer for. They have frittered away the energies of the working class by so-called reforms that have left the workers in the same position as when they started; they have turned working-class militancy into apathy; they have upheld the slaughter of one nation's workers by another; they have led the trade unions into a position of tacit support for capitalism, by basing their wage claims on rises in the

cost of living and production, instead of the basic fact of worker's exploitation. One could go on enumerating the policies by which the Labour Party has caused incalculable harm to the working class of this and other countries, but what is perhaps most unforgivable of all, they have deluded people into imagining that what they were doing was somehow bringing the equalitarian society of socialism nearer.

Our message to working people is this: Instead of looking to leaders and political racketeers to solve their problems, they should start examining the problems for themselves, and see what it is that keeps them in economic subjection. Once they do this, they are well on the way to seeing that only the abolition of classes and private property can solve their problems, and at the moment of this realisation, the golden days of Henry Ford, Bernard Docker, Anthony Eden (and Mr. Gaitskell) will be over.

A. W. I.

Some Comments on the American Election

We take our elections somewhat more seriously than they appear to do in the United States. Here the stunts are a little more subtle, less reminiscent of circuses and music-hall shows. But there is something in the American way of life after all, for if we are going to have the farce every few years of "choosing" between capitalism and capitalism, let it at least be entertaining.

And no one can deny that the American elections are that.

The "Choice"

In America the two major parties are the Republicans and Democrats, and it has been said that the difference between the two is that one is in power and the other is out. This is true in America even as it is in this country with the Labour and Conservative Parties. Tradition plays a large part in American support for their parties. The Democratic Party is traditionally "for labour," although in practice this means little except that they can count on some support from the Trade Unions. Traditionally the deep South, with its violent opposition to any advancement for the negroes, is Democratic, but some Democrats of the North, who consider the Party to be "progressive," are considerably embarrassed by the reliance that the Party places on its Southern support.

Personalities

Personalities are important in any election, so we should see who are the people hoping to get the votes in the present election.

The Republican candidate for President is, of course, Eisenhower. A man by experience not a politician, but a soldier, mainly useful to his Party because of his extraordinary popularity. He appears to be something in the nature of a figurehead in that, judging by his speeches, he does not show signs of having a great grasp of the problems that his government has to attempt to tackle, and his comments are usually vague generalities mixed with good will, such as when, speaking on the problems of de-segregation of schools, he said: "Here is a problem, charged with emotionalism, where everybody has got to work hard with all of the strength he has, and I think

that the more that work is done privately and behind the scenes rather than charging up on the platform and hammering desks, the better and more effective it will be." This statement was in answer to a question as to his policy, and it will be seen that although he says quite clearly that we must all work hard to solve the problem, he does not suggest what the solution should be.

His running mate, for Vice-President, is Richard Nixon. A young man, with a reputation for ambition, and unpopular with both Parties, he would probably not have been nominated had not Eisenhower backed him.

On the Democratic side we have the Presidential candidate in Stevenson. He is the man who didn't want to be President, and who, in 1952, took a lot of persuading to agree to stand. This time it was easier. As one columnist said (before Stevenson agreed to stand in this election), it is a little difficult to play the reluctant virgin twice.

The reluctant egg-head

Stevenson has a great disadvantage in a politician in that he has a reputation for being intelligent. This is commonly known in the United States as being an "egg head," and although in most countries intellectuals are looked upon with some suspicion, this is particularly so in the United States. In the last election Stevenson lost many votes because of his habit of using words of more than two syllables, but this time he is determined to overcome this disadvantage. In the recent Californian Primary election campaign he met "the common man" on street cars, shook hands, kissed babies and young ladies, and spoke in a way that the people could understand. It worked, although it is said that Stevenson looked most uncomfortable in his new role. One of the minor aspects of his background that could affect the voting is that he has been divorced. Although he has not remarried, it is thought that some Catholic voters would feel unable to vote for him for that reason.

The Common Man himself

The Democratic Vice-Presidential candidate is Estes Kefauver. He is the man who wanted to be President, but has settled, for the moment, for the chance of being Vice-President. Kefauver goes in for all the gimmicks

of elections—only more so than anyone else. He has put hand-shaking on an assembly line basis, and has worn more funny hats than any other American politician—his favourite being the coon-skin hat. Kefauver is a contradiction—a man who goes in for more electioneering tricks than the others, but a man who is generally liked by the public—especially in the farming areas, and disliked by other politicians. One voter explained that he liked Kefauver because you felt that if he came by when you were raking manure in a field, you felt sure that he was the sort of man who would take off his jacket and start raking beside you. On policy Kefauver is somewhat vague. One columnist described his attitude thus: "When asked precisely what he stands for, he is likely to hesitate, ponder painfully, and finally come up with some such phrase as 'a place in the sun for the farmer,' or 'the best interests of the plain people of this nation,' or 'an even break for the average man.'" (*Time*, 17/9/56).

The two most important internal issues are: (1) The Farm Crisis, and (2) De-Segregation.

The Farm crisis has arisen partly from the encouragement that was given to farm production in wartime and from the unfortunate fact that since the war the harvests have been good! This means that in order to avoid swamping the market with foodstuffs, which would decrease the prices and the profits, the Government has for some years guaranteed the farmers certain prices, and has purchased surpluses which have been stored in larger and larger quantities. This has in time produced other quite serious problems, such as where to store the surpluses when all available warehouses and the holds of the "moth-ball" fleet are packed full? This is what each party is trying to answer. The Republican answer is quite simple. Pay the farmers, they say, to take land out of production and allow it to lie fallow for a time. Thus, less land will be "in production," and consequently less food will be produced, and the Crisis (!) will be mitigated. The Democratic answer is the continuation of the present policy, except that greater guarantees should be given to the farmers.

It will be seen that neither of these policies attempts to deal with this basically farcical, as well as tragic, problem of capitalism. What a problem it is to have so much surplus food! Simple—make sure you have less in future. These are the policies propounded by those who are fond of saying that Socialism would not work because there would not be enough to go round under Socialism. If America attempts to sell off the surpluses at cheap prices abroad, they are liable to precipitate a crisis in another country (as was threatened recently in South America).

Segregation

Recently the Supreme Court in the U.S. gave judgment that segregation of white and coloured children in American schools was contrary to the Constitution. This provoked riots in the Southern States recently when the school year commenced and some coloured children tried to take their places in white schools. The Southern States are in most cases determined to avoid compliance with the Supreme Court ruling, and are in many cases attempting to devise laws that will achieve the same end (i.e., segregation) in an apparently legal manner. On this subject both parties are most cautious in making statements. At the recent Democratic Conference the following statement was adopted: "Recent decisions of the Supreme Court relating to segregation have brought consequences of vast importance to our nation as a whole and

especially to communities directly affected. We reject all proposals for the use of force to interfere with the orderly determination of these matters by the Courts . . . (the Supreme Court's decisions) are part of the law of the land." An attempted addendum that "We pledge to carry out these Supreme Court decisions," was rejected.

Earlier in the campaign the Republican Party also was loth to commit itself on the racial issue. However, within the last few weeks they have been more outspoken. Some commentators have suggested that this is due to the fact that the Republicans have resigned themselves to the fact that the Democrats are firmly entrenched in the South, and that even if the Republicans courted the Southern votes with opposition to de-segregation, they would not have much success. It is interesting to observe, however, the reasons given for support for advancement of the negro. Nixon, speaking at Louisville on the 27th September, was reported in the *New York Herald Tribune* as follows: "The U.S. cannot afford the cost of discrimination. The loss of negro intellectual resources fully developed amounts to \$15,000,000,000 a year in terms of the gross national product, now running at a \$400,000,000,000 rate." (28/9/56). Thus, no mention is made of any ideals of freedom or justice for the negro population—merely the economic loss suffered by the country's capitalists.

Policy?

Generally, the Republican Party in this election is, as Ike says, "relying on their record," which is "prosperity." This means, of course, prosperity for big business, for, as Stevenson says, "There are ugly patches of poverty and insecurity which still deny dignity, even decency, to the lives of almost one-fifth of all American families."

Stevenson's answer to the problem is that if his party was in power things would be different, but when we examine the proposals that he makes for changes in policy, it is clear that his programme differs in no essential manner from that of the Republicans.

Western "Democracy"

So this is the much vaunted "two Party system" that is recommended by British and American politicians to countries with more complicated party systems, such as France and Italy, and to totalitarian countries such as those behind the iron curtain! From the point of view of the ruling class, there is much to be said for it. Given two parties that oppose each other but whose policies do not differ fundamentally, the people are likely to spend their political energies arguing the toss between the two, without realising that there is a practical alternative to the system of capitalism.

Our View

What has a Socialist to say about these parties and their personalities and policies?

What is clear in America, as in Britain, is that for the worker (and this includes the many who like to consider themselves "middle class") there is little to choose between the parties, and the only arguments are as to which can run capitalism in the more efficient manner.

A Socialist examines the record of those parties which have claimed to govern in the interests of the mass of the people. Any objective analysis of the past shows that all these attempts have failed. Why have they failed? Is it for lack of good will, corruption, lack of knowledge or intelligence or honesty? These factors crop up continually in politics where there are rich plums for the successful, but the reason for consistent failure by all contenders to save Capitalism is that the nature of

Capitalism itself is that it is a class society, which can only be run in the interests of the ruling class, the Capitalists.

Some Election Slogans

Do you want the threat of war to continue and possibly become a fact? Do you want the continuance of poverty while food surpluses pile up and goods accumulate which the poor cannot afford to buy? Do you want a continuance of the insecurity which means that even if you have a job now, you may be unemployed tomorrow if there is a slump? Do you want to ensure that the housing problem will remain unsolved? Do you want to make sure that your children will have a life much like yours, with all these problems that will crush the humanity out of them, make them automatons, and take the joy out of life?

In a word, do you want Capitalism?

Of course, these aren't the words that are used to ask for your votes. But this is what, in fact, is offered you at each election, and what is being offered to the American elector now.

To the voter in America or elsewhere we say—*there is a real alternative*. With your help we can establish Socialism. Without it we, along with you, will continue to have all the problems of Capitalism, whichever party is in power.

Socialism will be a world-wide society in which the means of production will be held in common and used for the benefit of the whole of society. It is profit and property which cause wars and poverty. It is Socialism that can make these problems things to read about in history books. L. B.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

The Delegate Meeting, held at Head Office on October 6th and 7th was well attended by members generally, although the only provincial delegation was from South-end and Birmingham. All the business was dealt with and discussion was good.

Fulham Branch have arranged a debate with the I.L.P. Readers will remember that earlier this year the Independent Labour Party challenged the S.P.G.B. to a debate. The challenge was accepted, and the debate took place at Bermondsey. The Fulham Branch have now challenged the I.L.P., and the debate will be held on Monday, 19th November, at 7.45, at Fulham Town Hall (opposite Fulham Broadway Underground Station). The representative for the I.L.P. will be Frank Maitland, and R. Coster will represent the S.P.G.B. The chairman will be Phillip Sansum, of the Anarchist Goup. The last debate was a success, and we must see that this one is also.

The Fulham and Chelsea Branches have now discontinued their two outdoor meeting stations for the winter. Although less meetings were held this year, due to bad weather (sixty-one were held last year), quite a number of very good meetings were held at Gloucester Road and Earls Court. Altogether about twelve different speakers have held meetings, including Comrade Fred Evans, of Los Angeles, U.S.A. Comrade Evans spoke to interested audiences at both these stations, in addition to Hyde Park and other meeting places.

Now that outdoor propaganda has closed down for the season the branch is holding regular weekly lectures and discussions at 6, Keppel House, Lucan Place, Chelsea, S.W.3, on Thursday evenings at 8 p.m. A number of lectures have already been held, and although attendances have not been as good as hoped for, this has been compensated by the excellence of the lectures. The Branch welcomes all members, sympathisers and readers of the *Socialist Standard* who live in the area of Chelsea to the meetings.

Islington Branch continues to press ahead with selling the *Socialist Standard*. Conservative estimates for September show at least twenty-three dozen copies sold. This energetic branch increased its order for the October sales

drive, and it is hoped to report some encouraging figures for the month when the results are to hand. Although canvassing is their main method of disposal, Islington have also established good sales via local news stands. Other branches please note.

Lunch Hour Meetings at Tower Hill. Meetings are held on Thursdays from one o'clock by Comrade Ambridge, assisted by Comrade MacGuinness. Assistance by other Party speakers, and members to sell literature, will be appreciated. As this is the only lunch-hour meeting place in London at the moment, it is hoped that members will do their best to support the meetings whenever possible.

Ealing Branch. Ealing Branch held a remarkably successful Social and Dance towards the end of September. There was an attendance of at least 60 members, sympathisers and friends, and a useful contribution was realised to Party funds. Another social has been authorised for just before Christmas.

Activities before Christmas will include two showings of documentary films, discussions, and another visit to one of the London museums. This latter will be followed by the usual social at a member's home. P. H.

TO MEMBERS AND BRANCHES

Head Office records are short of certain Party documents. Will any member or Branch possessing any communicate with the E.C. We particularly need any old Party minutes that were handed out to be typed.

FROM MRS. BEETON'S ALL ABOUT COOKERY (Current Edition)

BENEVOLENT SOUP

Cheap soup suitable for a soup kitchen.

INGREDIENTS: $\frac{1}{2}$ an ox-cheek, 4 celery tops, 2 large carrots, 4 large onions, 2 large turnips, 1 cabbage, salt and pepper, a bunch of herbs, 10 quarts of cold water, $1\frac{1}{2}$ pints of dried peas or lentils.

TIME: About 6 or 7 hours. **SUFFICIENT** for 12 quarts of soup.

DOCUMENTARY FILMS at HEAD OFFICE

Documentary Films followed by brief Socialist comments at H.Q.

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET, S.W.4.

(near Clapham North Tube Station)

Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.

The meeting is then open for questions and discussion which can be continued in the Social Room afterwards when light refreshments will be on sale. Visitors particularly welcome.

Nov. 4th "Paintings of Vereshagin"—E. KERSLEY.

" 11th "The City"—C. KILNER.

" 18th "Speed the Plough"—V. PHILLIPS.

" 25th "Room for Discussion"—E. HARDY.

Dec. 2nd "Balzac"—R. COSTER.

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day	1/-	(Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War	1/-	" " 1/2
Russia Since 1917	1/-	" " 1/2
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years	1/-	" " 1/2
The Racial Problem—A Socialist Analysis	1/-	" " 1/2
Socialism	4d.	" " 6d.
Socialism or Federal Union	4d.	" " 6d.
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy	4d.	" " 6d.
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?	4d.	" " 6d.
Nationalisation or Socialism?	6d.	" " 8d.

All obtainable from the Literature Committee, 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ...	3.30—6 p.m. and 7—10 p.m.
East Street (Walworth) ...	Nov. 4th 11 a.m.
	" 11th 12.30 p.m.
	" 18th 11 a.m.
	" 25th 12.30 p.m.
Whitstone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

WEDNESDAYS

Gloucester Road Station ... 8 p.m.

THURSDAYS

Notting Hill Gate ... 8 p.m.

FRIDAYS

Earls Court Station ... 8 p.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
- 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
- 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
- 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
- 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
- 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
- 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
- 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

- "THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).
- "PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).
- GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).
- "RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).
- RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).
- SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).
- WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).
- WEALDSTONE Station (Sunday morning).
- KENTON Station (Sunday morning).
- HAMMERSMITH—King Street. (SMITH'S (not W. H.) Newsagents).
- HOLLOWAY: Paper shop, D. Johnston, Brecknock Road.
- FINSBURY PARK STATION: Main paper stall.
- NAG'S HEAD, HOLLOWAY: Main paper stall.
- HIGHBURY CORNER: Main paper stall—station.

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)
BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol, 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.
DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.
EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh
OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA BRANCH LECTURES

at
6, KEPPEL HOUSE, LUCAN PLACE, CHELSEA, S.W.3.
THURSDAYS at 8 p.m.
 November 15th "The Sane Society"—F. WARLOW.
 " 22nd Title to be announced—T. FAHY.

ISLINGTON BRANCH LECTURES

at
CO-OP HALL, 129, SEVEN SISTERS ROAD, N.7.
THURSDAYS at 8 p.m.
 November 15th "New Towns for Old"—C. KILNER.
 " 22nd Branch Discussion with a representative of the "Young Pacifist Movement."

LEWISHAM BRANCH LECTURE

at
DAVENPORT HALL, DAVENPORT ROAD, LEWISHAM S.E.6
 on
MONDAY 19th NOVEMBER, at 8 p.m.
"Automation." Speaker—E. HARDY.

TWO PAMPHLETS ON RUSSIA

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—It's Origin and Outcome,"
 (Published by the Socialist Party of Canada, obtainable from
 S.P.G.B. 50 pages, 6d., post free 8d.)

"RUSSIA SINCE 1917," (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/3).

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
 Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
 Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
 (6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
 (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Big Bull's Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. Nov. 1st and 15th.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reeve Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles. Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., at 34, St. George's Square, S.W.1. (Wilcox, top flat). All enquiries to Branch Secretary, J. Keys, 6, Keppel House, Lucan Place, Chelsea, S.W.3.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (Nov. 14th and 28th) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, Nov. 5th and 19th at 8 p.m. at 76, Dumbarton Road, Partick. Communications to R. Russell, Secretary, 401, St. Vincent, Glasgow, C.3.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at 12, Mare Street, Hackney (Cambridge Heath end). Sec.: A. I. Viney, 99, Somerford Estate, Stoke Newington, N.16.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Steed, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (Nov. 7th and 21st) at 127, Constantine Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, Nov. 5th, and 19th George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec.: J. M. Breakey, 2, Dennison Avenue, Manchester 20. Phone: DIDbury 5709.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o. Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 17, Coltswood Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8-10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, S. Hills 1, Devonshire Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., "Skara Bras" Farm Crescent, Woodham Road, Battlebridge, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOD GREEN AND HORNSEY Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Ramsay, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- * Canvass the S.S.
- * Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- * Submit names for sample copies.
- * Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- * Get libraries to display the S.S.
- * Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.
- * Deliver the S.S. to regular Subscribers in your area

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

No. 628 Vol. 52 December, 1956

Hungary and Suez—Hope Amidst Tragedy

MANIFESTO ON THE SUEZ CRISIS

THE INTERESTING CASE OF MR. PETER FRYER

NOTES BY THE WAY

DAY TO DAY RUNNERS OF CAPITALISM

HAPPENINGS IN HUNGARY

Registered for transmission to
Canada and Newfoundland

Monthly

THE GOVERNMENTS OF Israel, Britain, France and Russia, when they resorted to war in October 1956 in pursuit of their own separate objectives, have at the same time struck a decisive blow to achieve something they never sought and are hardly aware of. Their tanks and bombers in a few days of destruction have helped to shatter the most hampering illusion of our generation, an illusion that has held back multitudes from taking the first step towards a real understanding of the problems facing the human race.

This illusion was the belief, held with equal fervour by democrats and Communists, and on both sides of the Iron Curtain, that there are "two worlds," essentially different in aims and conduct.

On the one side the democrats and Labourites of the Western world believed that they and their rulers are guided by a superior moral code, are inherently against brutality, are committed to "law not war," and to United Nations, and are incapable of naked aggression to further their interests.

On the other side were the Communists and their followers, who believed with equal sincerity that Russia, by virtue of being a "Socialist" country, is free from and superior to the sordid imperialism and colonialism of the West, and utterly incapable of opposing the aspirations of ordinary workers.

Now the foundations of both beliefs have been smashed into fragments. Sincere men and women in both camps are horrified and heartbroken to discover in one revealing flash that the men they revered and the men they reviled behave in exactly the same criminal way; that the Edens and the Krushchevs are blood brothers after all, worshippers of the same capitalist god of violence and war. The sickening dismay of those who trusted Eden, "the friend of United Nations," is only equalled by that of Communists who see Russian tanks smashing down Hungarian workers. For both groups the one thing that could not happen has happened.

This sudden and dramatic exposure of the sham on both sides of the Iron Curtain provides a splendid opportunity for Socialists, who alone can give a valid explanation to the bewildered adherents of the rival ideologies. Only the Socialist can explain that it is not a failure of men, but the unavoidable results of the workings of the the social system. The division of the world into separate capitalist states, each seeking to achieve its own commercial ends amid the international rivalries, compels each government again and again to make the choice between using military force to achieve some gain and enduring some weakening and loss by not using military force; the ideals and temperament

^D
4

of the men who make up the governments is of minor, indeed negligible importance; they all have to use the same methods or get out.

The Socialist, too, and only the Socialist, can deal with the difficulty of the admirers of Russia. At the core of their admiration is the belief that Russia is "Socialist," and only the Socialist can deny this fraud and explain the truth. State capitalism, the conduct of financial, commercial and trading operations by a government in place of a private company is not Socialism and has no relationship to Socialism. It is not the manner in which these operations are controlled, but the nature of the operations that constitutes them capitalist. The efforts of a government, Russian, British, Indian, or any other, to control sources of raw materials, protect frontiers and trade routes and capture markets

for its exports—these activities are the cause of war, no matter how or under what flag they are conducted. The worker in every country in the world should take to heart the elementary truth that wars are not made by wicked foreigners, but at home, in the land he lives in; through the everyday activities, seemingly peaceful and innocent, of those who employ him and make profit out of him, and who seek to sell the products of his labour in world markets against the similar activities of other employers under other governments. This is the factor common to all the countries; the factor that drives governments into war and workers to their death in fratricidal combat with their fellows. But this factor is the capitalist organisation of society, and only Socialists know the remedy, the introduction of a world-wide basis of a different social system: Socialism. H.

NOTES BY THE WAY

So they couldn't kid Mikardo!

Mr. Mikardo is Labour M.P. for Reading. Two years ago he visited Hungary and wrote about it in *Tribune* (17/9/54) under the title: "There's very little poverty in Red Hungary," though he thought their standard of living was 30 per cent. below that of British workers. The declared intention of the article was to expose as fairy tales and "imaginative fiction" all the stories he had heard about poverty and discontent, surveillance by secret police, subjection to the Russian army settled in the country, etc. On the contrary, wrote Mr. Mikardo, he was allowed to see what he wanted, was able to talk freely and found people who "didn't hesitate to criticise the regime." He saw only few Russian soldiers and only one person wearing a Communist Party badge. He ended with the cocky avowal: "Old Mikardo isn't an easy guy to kid at any time anyway."

It looks as if Mr. Mikardo owes some explanation to the readers of *Tribune*.

Pause for Humbug

"It was one of those incredible situations that could only happen in London—Sir Anthony Eden and Russian Ambassador Jacob Malik sipping from the same loving cup. It happened last night amid the splendour of the Lord Mayor's banquet in cathedral-like Guildhall."—*Daily Sketch*, 10/11/56.

Pollitt and the Red Army

Three years ago Mr. Harry Pollitt sent "greetings to the Soviet Army." (*Daily Worker*, 23/2/1953). Along with the usual thanks for the debt "we" owe to the Russian branch of capitalism's greatest industry, that for destruction, Mr. Pollitt said:

"We know the Soviet Armed Forces will never be used for aggression, but are on guard for peace."

The Communist Party should send him to Budapest to tell this to the Hungarian workers—but make sure that he does so under the protection of some Russian tanks and the secret police.

The War that saved the Peace

On Saturday, November 17th, a week after the day set aside in remembrance of two world wars "for peace,"

two men were justifying two recent wars. One was Sir Anthony Eden, about the invasion of Egypt:

"The truth is that we have checked a drift which would have ended in the loss of countless lives and more other evils than we can ever estimate."—*Evening Standard*, 17/11/56.

The same day Mr. J. R. Campbell, in the *Daily Worker*, was justifying the Russian onslaught in Hungary under the title: "The choice that saved Peace." He claimed that it prevented "a possible prolonged civil war. This would have been pregnant with the terrible danger of a third world war."

Eden and Campbell did not get together to concoct their joint story beforehand. It just happens that they are in the same line of business, that of justifying the brutality of their respective capitalist groups.

Mr. Zilliacus and arms for Israel

Writing to the *Manchester Guardian* (6/8/56), Mr. Zilliacus, Labour M.P. for Gorton, explained his policy for preserving peace in the Middle East. One point was, as an immediate emergency measure, the provision of arms for Israel. We wonder what he thinks of his policy now. Perhaps he can get comfort from the fact that Israel got its arms—by capturing Russian and British tanks from the Egyptian army. We await, with all due reverence, Mr. Zilliacus's new pontifical pronouncement on how to prevent capitalism causing wars.

The Emotions of the "New Statesman"

The *New Statesman*, which tirelessly zig-zags about in its search for new ways of improving capitalism, has sadly admitted, in an editorial (3rd November, 1956) that it was wrong about Israel.

"Most British Socialists felt emotionally involved in the well-being of Israel, and ever since 1945 this journal has supported the Israelis through good times and bad. But we cannot support Israel in her present action, or rejoice when we try to estimate its long-term consequences."

Of course, the *New Statesman* does not speak for Socialists, and Socialists do not decide their attitude by emotional preferences for one capitalist government against another. The *New Statesman* sees Israel as a group of homeless, persecuted Jewish refugees, refusing to recognise that the State of Israel is something quite

different. It is a new, expanding capitalist state, backed by finance and arms from overseas, trying to establish itself in opposition to the existing Middle East states, each with its own interests and aims.

Now Nasser's the Pin-up Boy

Disillusionment with the failure of its fatuous policy which favoured Israeli capitalism, the *New Statesman* will probably spend a few years admiring another capitalist figure-head, Colonel Nasser, until he, too, "lets them down." Mr. Shinwell, formerly War Minister and Minister of Defence, in the Labour Government, has been unable to make the *New Statesman*'s quick somersault, and is very critical of the Labour Party's attitude to Eden's action. He says that "Now it seems there are many people in the Labour Party who regard Nasser as a hero." (*Daily Sketch*, 3/11/56).

But Mr. Shinwell is like the *New Statesman* in letting his emotions decide his attitude—only his emotions are still stirred by Israel, not Egypt:

"I glory—I repeat glory—in the fact that the Israelis have had the courage to defend themselves." What a pity all these emotions cannot be lavished on the working class in their struggle against capitalism.

Abadan and Egypt

The dress rehearsal for the Eden invasion of Egypt was Abadan in 1951, staged not by Tories, but by the Labour Government. When Persia nationalised the Abadan oil refinery, the Labour Government was outraged, and though they had not even the fig-leaf pretence that this was an issue affecting all countries (the Eden argument about the Suez Canal), the Government immediately started using force to intimidate the Persian Government, which duly protested to the world at large and to the American President in particular. Mr. Shinwell discloses has part in the business:

"When the Abadan situation emerged, as Minister of Defence, I alerted a brigade and sent them out by air to the Middle East—with the full consent of the Labour Cabinet."—(*Daily Sketch*, 3/11/56.)

The *Sketch* adds this comment:

"The 16th Independent Parachute Brigade Group was sent to Cyprus, and British warships to the Abadan area. But Mr. Attlee ordered the evacuation of the refinery." War was avoided, and the dispute was "settled" on a basis which enabled American oil companies to get a big foothold in Persian oil, a setback for British oil interests and the British Government that has rankled with them ever since.

Movement for the Improvement of the Secret Police

The Secret Police and You is a pamphlet issued by the "Campaign for the Limitation of Secret Police Powers." It is signed by the usual mixed bag of "progressives," including Labour and Liberal M.P.s, Aneurin Bevan, the Rev. Donald Soper, Kingsley Martin, etc., etc. Alarmed by such cases as that in which Mr. John Lang lost his job with I.C.I., apparently because his wife had been a Communist and he was, therefore, regarded as a "security risk," the Campaign Council wants the procedure for vetting potential unreliares regularised and provided with safeguards for the innocent, while ferreting out the "guilty." It has drafted a five-point code which "would impose a legal restraint on the arbitrary power of the executive and set standards both of fairness and of efficiency for the security services by obliging them to bring forward really convincing evidence."

It thinks M.I.5 is not very efficient, and wants the job of identifying potential spies to be done by "experts," since it is "a highly skilled business." (Page 12).

They warn us that present procedure makes a mockery of "all the legal safeguards of which England has boasted since the 17th century."

On the face of it there seems to be no reason why the Campaign should not achieve some success with its proposals, especially if they can convince the Government that its M.I.5 could and should be made more efficient.

The one thing for which the Socialist searches in vain is any explanation why the working class should need a secret police. Judging from Hungary, where, at the first opportunity, the workers lynched all they could get hold of, there is at least some reason to suppose that workers don't want a secret police at all. But here they are up against the Campaign Council.

Professor Gilbert Murray's support for war

Believers in the United Nations who have for years regarded Professor Gilbert Murray as a stalwart for that cause have been dismayed to learn that he defends Eden. His reasons were given in a letter to *Time and Tide* (10th November) in the course of which he wrote:

"The real danger was that, if the Nasser movement had been allowed to progress unchecked, we should have been faced by a coalition of all Arab, Muslim, Asiatic and Anti-Western States, led nominally by Egypt, but really by Russia; that is, a division of the world in which the enemies of civilization are stronger than its supporters. Such a danger, the Prime Minister saw, must be stopped instantly and since the UN has no instrument, it must be stopped, however irregularly, by those Nations who can act at once." His new hope is that the U.N. will create its own permanent "Police Force." H.

MANIFESTO ON THE SUEZ CRISIS

THE monster of war has raised its ugly head again, and once more the workers have been called upon to take up arms and risk their lives in their masters' quarrels. Still erecting monuments to dead heroes of past wars, the governments mock them by engaging in the preliminaries of what may be another shambles on behalf of capitalist self-interest.

The usual flimsy pretexts were broadcast to cover this most brutal and bloody of all the consequences of the present exploiting system. The victims of the past are forgotten in the fervour of conquest for gain.

The hypocritical blustering of the warmongers is matched by the feeble and contradictory protests of the alleged anti-war and peace committees, the reformists, and other deluded groups, all thrown into confusion when faced with this calamitous product of the workings of international Capital.

The Invasion of Egypt

At the end of October the British and French Governments, on the hollow pretext of stopping the war resulting from the Israeli invasion of Egypt, launched a

massive air attack on the latter country as a prelude to landing troops along the Suez Canal. The real objects of this aggression were transparently clear. It was designed to regain control of the Canal from the Egyptian Government, protect resources of oil and the holdings and profits of the oil companies in the Arab countries, as well as to safeguard the French Colonies in North Africa. It was a naked clash of capitalist interests; the Egyptian capitalists, backed by Russian arms, trying to establish their dominance in the Middle East, and the British and French imperialists trying to hold on to what they had filched in earlier wars.

The rival slogans of "national sovereignty," "international rights," "restoring peace," etc., only thinly disguised the sordid motives of the different ruling class groups and, failing to get the backing of other governments in the United Nations, the British Tory and the French Labour Premier contemptuously defied the body to whose principles they pay lip-service.

Guilt of the Labourites

This act of aggression was repudiated as an outrage by the British Labour Party, their spokesmen uttering hysterical denunciations of "power politics"; making tearful pleas for the soldiers thrown into battle against their will; and pleading for the peaceful settlement of international conflicts. Their speeches reeked of hypocrisy! It was the Labour Government that imposed conscription for the Tories to make use of, and they who prepared the way by launching the £1,500 million a year rearmament programme, the biggest peacetime massing of weapons of destruction ever known in British history. The Labour Opposition who say that British soldiers should not be used in *this* war have supported every major war in the lifetime of their party, including the Korean War, in which American Capitalism fought against Chinese and Russian State Capitalism for control of Korea, and where altogether over a million soldiers and civilians lost their lives.

Hypocritical Communists

The Communist Party vied with the Labour Party in condemning the invasion of Egypt while, at the same time, contorting themselves to condone and justify the bloody slaughter in Hungary, where invading masses of Russian tanks shot down workers who were trying to improve their miserable conditions and get rid of the ruthless Russian domination. While Russia and the United States condemn Britain and France for invading Egypt, Britain and France condemn Russia for invading Hungary; could hypocrisy and cynicism go further?

Futility of United Nations Organisation

The resolutions passed by the United Nations Organisation figure prominently in the battle of words about the invasion, and the Labour Party contrasts the Korean War, which they and the majority of the United Nations endorsed, with the present Anglo-French aggression, which is condemned. The contrast is completely misconceived, as indeed is the whole propaganda which claims that the United Nations is an organ which can prevent war and, therefore, deserves working-class support.

War is caused by the commercial rivalries that are necessarily engendered by world Capitalism. Each country builds up armed forces to maintain its position

in the capitalist world, and no group which believes it has a vital interest at stake will be deterred from using its armed forces by United Nations resolutions. In 1950, when South Korea was invaded, the American Government, believing its position in the Pacific to be jeopardised, at once moved its armed forces into action. The decision of U.N.O. to endorse military sanctions against the invaders was taken *after* the American Government had acted; had the vote gone the other way, the U.S.A. would have fought the war just the same. Other examples are the Indian Government's military occupation of Kashmir, in spite of a U.N. decision that a plebiscite should be held to determine whether that territory should go to India or to Pakistan. Egypt likewise defied the U.N. vote about allowing Israeli ships through the Suez Canal.

The United Nations (like the League of Nations a quarter of a century earlier) was set up because the politicians dared not face their war-weary peoples without being able to offer them something that would deceive them into thinking that their sacrifices had not been in vain. The United Nations is a capitalist institution useless to the working class.

The farcical nature of U.N.O. extends also to the British United Nations' Association. The Association condemns the British Government's action, but among the prominent men who are its Presidents and Vice-Presidents are Eden and other Tory leaders!

Capitalism the cause of war

Capitalism is an exploiting system under which the workers—the mass of the population—produce the goods that are sold to provide the profit out of which the owners of the means of production and distribution accumulate their riches. Profit, the surplus left over after the expenses of production and distribution have been met, is the mainspring of the system. In order to obtain this profit goods have to be sold at home and abroad. This necessitates markets, trade routes and sources of supply. It is over these that Capitalists quarrel and finally plunge into war. So it is today. The main source of the present crisis concerns oil—the lucrative "black gold" so urgently sought after, protected and fought over on the diplomatic field as well as on the battlefield.

International working-class unity

All this points to the necessity of international working-class action to abolish the cause of war. Unfortunately, the workers are still at loggerheads internationally and are a prey to all sorts of emotional upsurges that do not bring them any fundamental relief. They will only unite when they understand the cause of and remedy for war as well as for the other evils they suffer. Only when the workers do understand and unite against Capitalism in all the countries of the world for the purpose of achieving Socialism, the ownership in common of all that is in and on the earth, will war vanish from the human horizon.

True to the stand taken by our Party in the wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45, we repeat from our 1914 War Manifesto words to guide working-class attitude to war and inspire action to achieve Socialism:

"HAVING NO QUARREL WITH THE
WORKING CLASS OF ANY COUNTRY,
WE EXTEND TO OUR FELLOW

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS THE EX-
PRESSION OF OUR GOOD WILL AND
SOCIALIST FRATERNITY, AND PLEDGE
OURSELVES TO WORK FOR THE OVER-
THROW OF CAPITALISM AND THE
TRIUMPH OF SOCIALISM."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN,
52, CLAPHAM HIGH ST., LONDON, S.W.4.
November 6th, 1956.
(The above manifesto was issued as a leaflet early
in November.)

DAY-TO-DAY RUNNERS OF CAPITALISM

Part I

BEFORE we get down to the matter in hand, it would be as well to make quite clear our own position on the question of political power. We shall be concerned with the plight of those who form governments under Capitalism and who try to persuade us that, with the proper policy and leadership, this system can run in the interests of everybody and even gradually disappear and become something other than just plain Capitalism.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is often accused, when we argue with Labourites and so-called Communists, of "splitting the workers." They claim it would better serve the interests of Socialism if we stopped being "puritans" and joined them in the "day-to-day struggle."

Our answer to these assertions is, and always has been, that we will join with any organisation provided it devotes its activities entirely to Socialism, and we have always pointed out that there can never be more than one Party in any country standing for Socialism, for the instant (supposing it so happened) two identical parties arose both firmly based on the principle of the class-struggle and clearly advocating political action for Socialism and Socialism alone, they would already be AS ONE and could but merge to form one body.

While they claim to stand for Socialism, such organisations as the Labour Party, Independent Labour Party, and the so-called Communist Party all have reform programmes of "immediate demands" on which they seek votes and, because their "something now" policies attract the support of non-Socialist voters, when elected they INEVITABLY find they have no mandate to do anything other than run CAPITALISM.

Clearly their behaviour brands them, one and all, as mere parties of capitalism, and denies them any real claim to being part of the "working-class movement for Socialism." We in the S.P.G.B. have always clearly explained Socialism, and when contesting elections have asked for votes on that ALONE; therefore, we could never become the guardians of the system we detest.

For us Socialism can have only one Party and only one meaning; i.e., a system of living under which the means of production—land, factories and machinery, etc., are in the COMMON holding of the WHOLE community. The wages system will cease to exist, there will be no classes, and instead of buying and selling for the profit of the few, goods and services will be freely available for USE by all. We further hold that this can only arise as the result of the conscious political triumph of the world working-class in their struggle against their only real enemy, the world capitalist class.

While the "left wingers" clamour for a change of government, we concern ourselves with what really matters, not a change of office boys, but a change of system.

We maintain that the wages system the world over is proof of workers being exploited, either for the benefit of private shareholders or government bondholders. Those who pretend that the State can be identified with the workers would ask us to accept the absurd notion that in Iron Curtain Capitalism workers really pay themselves wages and get the profits they create back, after due deductions for the H-bomb war machine, etc. Capitalism means wage labour for the majority precisely because they are PROPERTYLESS and have no "means of living" other than hiring themselves out to an employer. Need we add the claptrap about "raising living standards" (if only workers work harder) was in common use in the capitalist world long before the present Russian rulers appeared. It is obvious to us, as it was to Marx, that it is for the wealth workers produce OVER and ABOVE the value of their wages that they are employed, and from which alone all interest, rent and profit can be explained.

It is a fundamental difference between ourselves and all other parties that they embrace LEADERSHIP while we reject it. Workers only need leaders while they do not know either the objective or the method; no "spear-head" or "thinking minority" can ever lead the working-class to Socialism, because leadership implies the ignorance of the followers. Like Marx and Engels, we have always maintained that the movement for Socialism is the "conscious movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority." (*Communist Manifesto*).

We find our work of propagating Socialism made very much harder by the confusion spread amongst workers by these "left wingers."

An example of their confusion emerged from the reports of Mr. Tom Driberg, on a recent interview in Moscow with Mr. Krushchev, which appeared in *Reynolds News* for the 9th and 16th of September, 1956. At this interview, before the word spinning about the British Labour Party began, comment was made on the activities of the so-called French Socialist Party (S.F.I.O.). Mr. Krushchev did not deny this party's claim to the title "Socialist," but merely bemoaned the fact that they had "formed a government which was waging a colonial war in Algeria, and its leaders were obliged, in order to retain power, to take account of right wing views." The fact that S.F.I.O. sought no mandate from its electors for Socialism and is therefore engaged in the business of running capitalism goes unnoticed by both Krushchev and Driberg; since the latter are themselves concerned in the same system, it is necessary for them to ignore fundamentals.

Labour Government

Referring to the Labour Party, Krushchev said: "God knows what it presents, it is not Socialist in aim,"

and further on: "I think some Conservatives are to the left of Gaitskell." He did not say why the *Daily Worker* and the British Communist Party support (at the moment) the Labour Party under Gaitskell against the more "left wing" Conservative elements. He also failed miserably to understand that left and right wings are inseparable parts of the same capitalist vulture.

Driberg in explanation said: "Our PROGRAMME for the next election could not yet be discussed, since it had not yet been worked out; that we are at present issuing statements on many aspects of POLICY which would be discussed at our Annual Party Conferences; and that a basic PRINCIPLE of the Labour Party was the basic Socialist principle of common ownership of the means of production" (his emphasis). The error contained in the end of this statement went unchallenged by Krushchev because to him, as to Driberg, common ownership means nationalisation. The Labour Party has no "basic" principles except the desire for power; if it had it would not be looking for a "programme." From time to time the phrase "common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange," has cropped up, but the inclusion of "exchange" nullifies the rest. Common ownership can only mean free access, "exchange" is a relationship between owning groups or classes.

Krushchev, still blaming "wrong" leadership, said: "Take your existing leaders—they are more afraid of Socialism than the Conservatives are. They talk about Socialism because the word is popular with the intellectuals now as well as with the masses. It is the same elsewhere: even Mr. Nehru, who is neither a Communist nor a Socialist, talks about a Socialist Plan for India. It's the same in Burma and Indonesia..." Interesting to note that when the interview ended Mr. Krushchev dashed away to a "luncheon" that Bulganin was giving in honour of the President of Indonesia!

Russia, of course, claims to have no "imperialist

motives," but her "peaceful co-existence" in her quest for world markets is capitalist co-existence, for exactly the same COMMERCIAL relationships confront the whole capitalist world.

Mr. Driberg wrote that people "often use the same words—words like 'freedom' and 'democracy' and 'socialism' to mean different things," but he "would remind Mr. Krushchev, with respect, that Soviet leaders themselves have repeatedly told us that they agree that there can be more roads than one to Socialism." It is sadly true that the words freedom, democracy and, above all, Socialism mean different things to different people, and two great contributors to this lack of clarity are the Labour and so-called Communist Parties. As for "Soviet leaders" who agree there are "different roads to Socialism," this only shows that Mr. Nehru is not the only one who has found Socialism a word "popular" with the masses.

Shifting to the Conservative Party, Mr. Driberg said: "Now I do hope that, just because Mr. Krushchev happened to meet a few individual Conservatives who talked in a progressive way, he is not misled about the essential character of the Conservative Party itself. It exists to promote the interest of capitalist big business. It is the Tory Party, and nobody else, that is the 'enemy of the working-class.'" Too bad the Labourites and Muskovites did not know this when, during the war, they lined up and formed a coalition with these "real" enemies to fight the Germans. A shame also that Mr. Driberg's memory of rising profits and frozen wages under the Labour Government which left "capitalist big business" as they found it, having secured government guarantees for State bondholders in the industries they nationalised, should have failed him.

Their insistence on not seeing the wood for the trees and their avoidance of obvious conclusions from their own position, inevitably made an utter farce of the whole interview.

H. B.

(To be continued).

STREET LAMPS AND DESIRE

THERE are two kinds of "leader," one "born to lead" and coached in the proper schools, the other, risen from humble beginnings and arriving the hard way. What they have in common is the desire to remain "on top" having got there. Dai falls into the latter category. His status in the hierarchy of leaders was quite a minor one, nevertheless very important to Dai—and to those bigger leaders whom he served. Dai is a "leader" in Local Government, grown wise in the running of the affairs of "Fiddlesborough."

After enjoying the ordinary education afforded to the average working-class child, he went to work in the mines, and his career can be said to have begun. Dai realised quite early that the average miner took little interest in union activity, apart from dues paying and occasional grousing, and less interest in political activity apart from occasionally casting a vote. He soon realised that workers were content to let others act on their behalf, and so he offered himself accordingly. He became Lodge Secretary, adding in the course of time official posts on various committees, including the Hospital Board, Y.M.C.A., and the local Civil Defence organisation.

His ultimate election to the Council was a sinecure. "Fiddlesborough" was an expanding community. New factories (manned by silicotic miners) were going up; houses being built; the social amenities needed looking into. Dai looked into them—at least he said he would, and leaders after all must lead somewhere. Dai chose street lighting as his battle cry (along with a variety of other things); he had read (on his way up) something about Lenin saying that Socialism meant the expansion of Electrical Power. What was right for a country was right for "Fiddlesborough." So Dai challenged the forces of Darkness and ignorance with the demand for more street lamps and power plugs in the home.

He "got in." This was some time ago. Looking back from the modest demands of those days to the "Fiddlesborough" of today, with its 10,000 T.V. masts, 40,000 electric cleaners, not to mention the most streamlined automatic strip-steel mill in Britain, makes one gasp at the vast changes that have taken place—and all under the guidance of a town council predominantly Labour, in itself led by the powerful personality of our Dai, now Alderman David Jones, J.P., whose portrait in oils can

be viewed every Wednesday and Friday in the Council Chamber at the Town Hall.

All this goes to show that the prizes offered for unstinted service are worth the effort. The workers are notoriously generous in their recognition of able leadership. Alderman Jones would perhaps agree that success, the achievement of one's desire, can only come about by a close study of a situation. It is necessary to "hit on something," in his case street lamps; from this one develops; one soon becomes accomplished in knowing what the workers want next, and so it is seen that happily the workers' needs afford fresh "talking points" and increased status to the leader.

It is quite true that workers should have better street lighting, home comforts, good roads and services. It is also true that these amenities do not touch on the real problem of their lives—poverty and insecurity. Socialists continue to point out the need for the greater illumination that will expose the evils of Capitalism that actually condemn millions of people in millions of "Fiddlesboroughs" to want and starvation. A needy person's

wants are no more satisfied by walking on a well engineered highway than if he wallowed in a swamp. The world is full of leaders and would-be leaders of various stature, all busily engaged in "getting on" or trying to "stay there."

Are you content to dribble your life away for a wage that merely keeps you in existence as a producer of wealth that you will never own for the privilege of sending your sons to any part of the world where Capitalist interests are threatened? Are you prepared to continue groping your way through the half-light of Capitalism street lamps withal ignoring the light that comes with the dawn of a Socialist World? If you are, then forget your dignity as human beings. Follow your leaders, and when the next holocaust comes along, give of your vast reservoir the sacrificial streams demanded for your leaders' protection.

If you are no longer prepared to do these things, get down to it now. You can change "Fiddlesborough." You can change all the Fiddlesboroughs of this world.

W. BRAIN.

HAPPENINGS IN HUNGARY

FREEDOM" has been the battle cry in countless revolutions and revolts throughout the ages, and recent events in Hungary must have recalled past sacrifices immortalised by poets, such as Byron's "Yet, Freedom! yet thy banner, torn but flying, streams like the thunderstorm against the wind."

At the present time the conscience of the world is being stirred by the heroic but unequal struggle which the Hungarians are waging against the military forces of the Soviet Union. The iron fist closes and the rebels drown in their own blood as another paragraph is completed in the history of Hungary—another event in a chapter of foreign invasions.

Western Bloc governments and their newspapers have mostly made statements sympathetic to the rebels. American government leaders in expressing their feelings for Hungary, were reported as saying that nothing could be done until after the elections, as they did not want to do anything to prejudice their re-election—surely touching a new "low" in cynicism.

The Western Bloc of capitalist powers desire to oust the Soviet Union from Hungary in order to enjoy the same material advantages, and not because of any lofty ideals. It is a question of business, not of ideals, for the latter do not flourish in the jungle of capitalist go-getters.

The *Daily Express* of 9th November printed an appealing photo of a small girl under the caption—"Stepping out to a new life; a small Hungarian refugee who has arrived at the Austrian border. Behind her are horrors that her young mind could not comprehend. Ahead of her—who knows? A succession of camps and hostels; or perhaps a new home in England. But she is wary. After these last weeks suspicion is instinctive." Then there was a report to the effect that a Wolverhampton firm offered a house, rent free, to a family of Hungarians; while a number of countries were reported as having offered sanctuary to numbers of refugees. There have been no reports, however, of sanctuary in Britain for Egyptian victims of the British military action in Suez.

The *Daily Express* published a series of articles by Dr. Edith Bone, who was released in the recent fighting after seven years solitary confinement in Hungary on a spy charge. Dr. Bone revealed that she had gone to Hungary as correspondent for the *Daily Worker*. The writer, who is a reader of that paper, is unable to recollect any agitation at any time over the disappearance of this colleague. Following her revelation, the *Daily Worker* confirmed her statement, and, believe it or not, added that they never could understand what had happened to her all this time. However, this newspaper is inundated with letters from comrades horrified at what has been going on in Hungary, and D. N. Pritt, Q.C., has written an article entitled "Hungary; Keep your Heads" (*Daily Worker*, 9th November), apparently in an effort to calm these comrades. He charges the popular press version of events as a complete fabrication of the U.S. capitalists, and ends his article with the following astonishing paragraph: "We should all be as happy to realise, in 1956, that the Soviet Union prevented the establishment of a fascist government in Hungary." Another article in the same issue plugs a similar theme, and is headed "Deep-laid Plot," and the penultimate paragraph reads: "In the circumstances, Soviet counter-intervention, if one may call it so, has surely been justified on grounds with which every British democrat, and especially every British worker, must sympathise."

The line on Hungary that this organ of the so-called Communist Party publish, and appear to get away with, is surely a scathing criticism of the low level of Socialist understanding on the part of their supporters. Perhaps the most brazen statement of all is on the front page of the same issue, in heavy print, describes the *Daily Worker* as "the only paper that puts the class and peace issues fair and square," and then goes on in the next sentence to put a question to their readers: "Friends of the *Daily Worker* everywhere—we ask you to settle one question with yourselves and then, immediately, with us. Could you, in our national situation, do without the *Daily Worker* NOW?"

(Continued on page 185)

THE SOCIALIST STANDARD

DECEMBER



1956

OFFICIAL NOTICE

Correspondence for the Executive Committee and articles for THE SOCIALIST STANDARD should be sent to the S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4, London; 'phone MAC 3811. Orders for literature to Literature Secretary. Letters containing postal orders, etc., should be sent to E. LAKE, S.P.G.B., at the above address. P.O.'s, cheques, etc., should be crossed and made payable to the S.P.G.B.

The Executive Committee meets every Tuesday at 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4 (Head Office), at 7.30 p.m.

THE INTERESTING CASE OF MR. PETER FRYER

Mr. Fryer is the Communist journalist who was sent by the *Daily Worker* to Budapest to report what was going on. Now Mr. Fryer has resigned from the *Daily Worker* (but not from the Communist Party) because he discovered that he was sent there not to report what he saw, but to cover up for the Russian Government. He sent three despatches and he subsequently told Mr. Colin Lawson, a *Daily Express* correspondent whom he met in Budapest what happened to them. (Published as an interview in *Daily Express*, 17th November).

The first despatch ("a straightforward account of what I had seen as soon as I arrived . . . on the night of October 20th.") was not used at all. The second despatch was an interview between Fryer and another Communist, Mr. Coutts, who had been in Budapest for three years as Editor of *World Youth*. This despatch "was cut, and cut ruthlessly," for the first edition of the *Daily Worker*. Members of the staff protested, and some of the cuts were restored in a later edition.

The third despatch was not published at all. It was suppressed by the Editor, J. R. Campbell, "who had that day returned from Moscow." He not only suppressed it, but "refused to let other members of the staff read it."

The *Daily Worker* never admits that it is under Communist control. It claims that it is the only paper "owned by its readers," but Mr. Fryer discloses that while Campbell was away in Moscow his "stand in" was Mr. George Matthews, assistant secretary of the Communist Party. (It was he who cut the second despatch).

Mr. Fryer, in the interview with Colin Lawson, expressed the following views:

"I take the view that the Soviet action in Hungary was a crime and a tragic blunder, both from the Soviet point of view and from the point of view of the whole international working class."

He denies the Communist Party argument that the Hungarian workers backed the Russian action.

"If the Soviet intervention was necessary to put down counter-revolution, how is it to be explained that some of the fiercest resistance of all was in the working-class districts of Ujpest and Csepel?"

(Incidentally, as late as 17th November, the *Daily Worker* was still reporting broadcast appeals by the new Hungarian government to the workers to end their strike, aimed, as the *Worker* admits, to enforce "the reinstatement of Mr. Nagy, the former Premier, and the withdrawal of Soviet troops.")

One last quotation from Mr. Fryer:

"I should say that the rising against what I would describe as the so-called Communist government of Hungary was supported by 99 per cent. of the people, including a great number of the ordinary honest rank and file members of the Communist Party. Nobody wanted the Russians to stay. Nobody wanted the secret police. They were sick and tired of both of them."

FIFTY YEARS AGO

(From the *Socialist Standard*, December 1906).

Imported nonsense

The sapient gentleman whom the *Daily News* is pleased to claim as its own special correspondent in Paris, in referring to the appointments of Viviani and Briand to the Clemenceau Cabinet says: "The Socialist ideal is, of course, the substitution of 'collective' exploitation for 'capitalistic' exploitation. The *Daily News* gentleman had better try again. 'The Socialist ideal is, of course'—nothing of the kind. It is the substitution of collective ownership and control for capitalistic ownership and control with the consequent extinction of exploitation altogether. The *Daily News* gent has been studying the work of those Socialists who unfortunately afflict the movement in France as in England. He has correctly stated their ideal. They are for State capitalism or collective exploitation. We are not concerned with State capitalism. We are concerned with Socialism. Socialism is the negation of capitalism. Consequently State capitalism cannot be the ideal of any Socialist. Ergo those who preach State capitalism or collective exploitation are not Socialists. The *Daily News* gent has been studying in the wrong school."

ADDRESSES OF COMPANION PARTIES

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA, P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Australia.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, P.O. Box 115, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND, Dublin, Eire.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND, P.O. Box 62, Petone, New Zealand.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, 11, Faneuil Hall Square, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.

The SOCIALIST STANDARD, WESTERN SOCIALIST and other Socialist literature can be obtained from the above.

Continued from page 183)

The pro-Soviet press claim that the revolt is an attempt by Hungarian fascists to seize control from a workers' government. The Western Capitalist press, on the other hand, report the trouble as a clash of two irreconcilable ideologies, that of Communism versus the democratic way of life—they see materialised the combat between evil and good, between the powers of darkness and of light, of the machinations of the Devil against the will of God.

A Socialist analysis of events in Hungary reveal the revolt as a nationalist movement determined to seize control for the benefit of the budding Hungarian capitalist class and, as such not worth the spilling of one drop of working-class blood. Like nationalist movements in other industrially backward countries, the revolt is led by students and supported by disillusioned workers and peasantry.

The *Observer* (4/11/56) contains an article headed "Students Led Hungarian Revolt," and starts with the statement that

"The Hungarian revolution began as a student movement. This I can say with absolute conviction, having just returned from Budapest, where I discussed the matter with the insurgents themselves."

"The events in Budapest on that Tuesday evening had in fact been slightly preceded by uprisings in two other university towns—Szeged and Pecs. There the students had simply called upon the town councils to resign and had re-elected emergency committees from their own numbers."

"These committees of 15 to 30 members containing professors and students, had a single president, who in more cases than not was undergraduate. The attitude of the older members of the community was that this was a student movement, and as such should be led by them."

"The Student committee of the revolution in Budapest itself seems to be an even more powerful body. Its president, a young man named Josef Molnar, works in constant liaison with Colonel Meleter, commanding the Hungarian Army in Budapest. Almost all the students at this university of technology are armed."

NATIONALISM IN TWO HEMISPHERES

IT'S a long way from Pontardulais to Pretoria: the latter, though way down in the Southern Hemisphere, is quite well known as the administrative centre of South Africa, while the former, though only within a few hours' journey from any part of the British Isles, is relatively unknown to people outside South Wales, being a sombre little township on the western edge of the coal-field. Yet anyone living in South Wales who has followed events in South Africa during the last few years can appreciate certain trends taking place that are common to both.

It has always been the contention of Socialists that (1) Capitalism, wherever it operates, despite differences in climate, language and culture, produces the same set of conditions from which inevitably flow the same problems. This is not to say that conditions are everywhere identical under Capitalism; different areas are often undergoing different stages of Capitalist evolution, depending on historical background. However, when Industrialism comes, late or early, Capitalism comes with it: they are bound up in each other.

(2) Capitalism, desiring always a submissive working class, seeks everywhere to condition the people: through the Church, universities, schools, newspapers, radio and other media of disseminating thought and ideas.

Hungary is only partially industrialised, and the expansion of the budding capitalist class is hampered by the Russian Government, who wish to keep the country as a market for their own industrial products and as source for raw material and food supplies as well as for strategic reasons. Russian political and economic experts help to manage the country and give less opportunities for educated patriotic Hungarians to rise to the top jobs. University students, particularly in backward countries, are mostly members of better-off families. They are usually firm supporters of their national capitalism, and their educated sons have the training to act as spokesmen and leaders. It is economic interest that is the mainspring behind the action of the students, even though it is concealed by high-sounding ideals. While the personal courage of the Hungarians may be recognised, how often the call for "Freedom" masks the need for the development of a new class in society!

Some of the workers, believing that the Hungarian control will solve their poverty problem, give their support. The peasants consider that an independent government will enable them to get a better market for their produce, though complete independence in the present-day world is more of an unobtainable ideal than practical power politics will allow, as Poland and Yugoslavia (not to mention a host of other small countries) have found out. This, then, is the Hungarian economic set-up which lies behind the barrage of propaganda.

The tragic bravery of the Hungarian students should not blind the workers to the fact that it is not in their interest to support the struggle of either the developed state-capitalism of the Soviet Union or the indigenous capitalism of Hungary. In other countries whenever the new ruling group is firmly in the saddle of government they lose no time in turning on the workers.

F. E. OFFORD.

government is concerning itself more and more with education. The latest step in this direction—the infamous Bantu Education Act, though causing concern and minor unrest in Church circles and among other well-meaning people, is but a logical step in the “progress” of Capitalism in Africa—especially Capitalism with a strong Nationalist party in power; which brings us to:

(3) The increase in Nationalist power in South Africa, with its increasing pressure on the native population, has evoked strong protests from groupings of all kinds among the white section of the community. Women's leagues are forming in battle array against Styrdom, intellectuals are speaking on behalf of the downtrodden native, novelists like Alan Paton and parsons like Michael Scott and Trevor Huddleston, proclaim the indignities imposed on their “black-brethren.” Whilst many of these people are sincere in their endeavours, they cannot see that “colour bar” Apartheid disease and all the other injustices are not a Cause in themselves, but an Effect. The cause is the system of Capitalism.

Nationalism is quite popular these days in South Wales. It has not committed any atrocities here as yet for many reasons; first, it is not yet unified (there are two Nationalist groups), and secondly, and most important, not being in power it cannot legislate. Nevertheless, true to the conflicting picture that Capitalist society presents, it has its supporters and its influence. History is, of course, invoked and the injustices of the past imposed on Wales are cleverly used by the Welsh Nationalist press. Nationalist influence is capturing the minds of many who are disillusioned with the Labour Party. Local education policy is setting up more and more Welsh schools (a form of child segregation by language qualification); teaching posts are more and more subject to language qualifications; certain newspapers are playing up to the revival in Nationalism, and

the Welsh League of Youth is spreading its membership into more and more schools and villages. On the surface much of this activity does not appear as Nationalism, some of it is really funny, like the situation mentioned in a South Wales town where women are driving non-Welsh speaking children away from their Welsh speaking playmates. (See *Western Mail*, 5/9/56).

No compounds yet; hardly as bad as South Africa, where a coloured person is not allowed on the streets without a pass after curfew, but still an unhappy state of affairs and pregnant with possibilities.

In South Africa, despite the segregation policy of the government (backed, in the main, by the Boer farmers), the Industrial Capitalists are not altogether happy. They know that a growing industrialism cannot afford segregation to the point required by the Nationalists. Capitalism does not care two hoots about national cultures, languages, or even pigmentation. It is interested in manpower (especially where human energy is cheap); we can, therefore, envisage better treatment for the native forced upon the government by the Industrialists—in the interest of Capitalism.

In Wales, strive as they may, deplore as some may, the passing away of native culture and perhaps the language too, is inevitable if Capitalism is to remain. Industry demands it. If the Welsh really want to preserve their language and culture (and it is well worth preserving), they must get rid of Capitalism. Socialists in Wales, who at no time conceal their Celtic tongue (often using it to explain Socialism), fight for one world, rich with its infinite variety of culture, utilised and enjoyed by all. Until such time our message to both the Welsh wage slaves and the Bantu herded in the compounds on the Rand, is: “You have more in common with each other than you have with your respective masters, be they Nationalists or Nationalizers or just plain Private Enterprise Capitalists.”

W. BRAIN.

AN EARLIER BOMBARDMENT OF EGYPT

EGYPT was under Arab and Turkish control for twelve hundred years up to 1873, when it secured independence from Turkey, but was still under British and French financial control. The Suez Canal, built by de Lesseps, was opened in 1869. In 1875 the British Government bought the Khedive's (Viceroy of Egypt) shares in the canal in order to safeguard the route to India. It was the beginning of the partition of Africa amongst the European powers, chief of whom were Britain, France and Germany.

Of this partition, Major-General Fuller has this to say in his book *War and Western Civilisation*:

“From 1870 onwards a veritable crusade was carried out by European nations in the name of Gold, every banker, statesman and merchant swearing on his cheque book for his personal profit to ‘civilize’ such portions of the world as could not defend themselves against the white man's rifles and cannon; for ‘progress’ to these people was synonymous with ‘conquest.’ Having since 1815 freed themselves from autocratic government, their one intention was to force the absolutism they had rejected down the throats of all peoples who happened to be any colour except white. As regards aggression, the years 1870-98 are only equalled by the age of Genghis Khan. Between 1870 and 1900 Great Britain acquired 4,754,000 square miles of territory, adding to her population 88,000,000 people; between 1884 and 1900 France acquired 3,583,580 square miles and 36,553,000

people; and in these same years Germany, a bad last, gained 1,026,220 square miles and 16,687,100 people.” (Pages 133-134.)

In 1882, under the influence of this “crusading” spirit, an Anglo-French squadron of ships was lying off Alexandria with steam always up. In Egypt a nationalist movement of revolt against European influence was being worked up by Arabi Pasha (an Egyptian officer) after the fashion of Nasser. Admiral Seymour, the commander of the fleet, learnt that the forts opposite them were being covertly strengthened and extensively armed. In the meantime rioting broke out in Alexandria and Europeans were attacked.

The *Graphic* newspaper for July 24th, 1882, published a supplement covering the Egyptian crisis. Of the Suez Canal it made the following remarks:

“The safety of the Suez Canal was another source of anxiety. Alarming reports were circulated of 5,000 disaffected soldiers being on the watch, of Bedouins haunting the banks, and of explosives being stored in Ismailia. Many of the officials left, and the Egyptian Ministry were asked by M. de Lesseps to secure the protection of the traffic. Ragheb returned a vague reply, hardly calculated to allay the anxiety, which was heightened by the rumour that Arabi intended to blow up the Canal on the first sign of British hostile intentions.”

How familiar it all seems! British and foreign

consuls warned their nationals to leave the country, and the authorities, one by one, removed their official property and staffs aboard ship. On the morning after the removal was completed Admiral Seymour sent an ultimatum to the Egyptian Ministry giving them twenty-four hours to surrender the forts for disarmament, under penalty of bombardment. Now let us quote the *Graphic's* account of what happened:

“The day passed without sign of submission, much to the evident satisfaction of the British officers and crews, and by 4 a.m. on the 11th inst., the order was given to prepare for action. Whilst the vessels took up their positions the men watched eagerly for signs of life in the forts, as they feared that the Egyptians would bolt without fighting, and on seeing the soldiers grouped in the defences, a smile of

grim satisfaction pervaded all faces. Hopes of the encounter were, however, damped by the appearance of the *Felicon*, bearing some Turkish officers, who announced that they had been rowing about all night to find the Admiral. They brought a Ministerial letter offering to dismount the Egyptian guns, but Admiral Seymour replied that the time for negotiations had passed, and gave the order to commence.”

The forts were subjected to an intense bombardment and in a few hours reduced to shapeless masses. A panic was produced in Alexandria, and the Egyptian army retreated after looting the shops.

The bombardment of Alexandria was followed by the subjugation of Egypt and the Sudan and the vision of territorial control right down to the Cape.

GILMAC.

PARTY NEWS BRIEFS

Propaganda in London. On Sunday, November 18th, a well attended meeting was held at Denison House, Victoria. The subject—Suez and Hungary. Comrades D'Arcy and Read addressed the meeting, and there were good questions and discussion. This meeting had been arranged at short notice, and its success was largely due to the work put in by many Comrades. A further meeting was also held on Thursday, 22nd November, at Ealing Town Hall. The Ealing Branch members did most of the preparatory work, and details of the meeting will be in the January issue.

Fulham Branch organised a debate with the Independent Labour Party, Frank Maitland represented the I.L.P. and Comrade R. Coster represented the Party. The debate was held at Fulham Town Hall, and the audience numbered two hundred people.

October Sales Drive. Six branches took part in organising a special sales drive, and despite the fact that the number of outdoor meetings is less after the Summer, when sales usually fall, 5085 copies of the *Socialist Standard* were sold. The deficit on cost was reduced to £14 10s.

These sales drives could become a permanent feature of Party activity. The more *Standards* sold, the more successful our propaganda, also a reduction in the cost of producing them.

Wickford Branch. A correction in the News Briefs for November. The reference to the Provincial delegates

should have read: “. . . the only Provincial delegation was from Birmingham, Southend and Wickford.” Sorry, Wickford Branch!

Ealing Branch are holding their Christmas Social at “The Ealing Park Tavern,” South Ealing Road (full details under Notices in this issue). Members are sure of a most enjoyable evening—book up with the Branch Secretary: E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

Hackney Branch. Members' and sympathisers' notice is drawn to the changed branch meeting venue—12, Mare Street, Hackney, E.8. Buses 6, 170, 555, 557, 106 and 653 pass the door. Branch meets Mondays at 8 p.m.

Meeting of Party Speakers. As the first two meetings proved so successful, it is hoped to arrange regular meetings. The last meeting of speakers was held on Monday, the 12th November. About 15 speakers and six non-speakers attended, and the discussion that took place—on the recent events in Hungary—was interesting and lively. Speakers exchanged information about the history of Hungary and recent events, and discussed interpretation of these events and methods of dealing with the matter on our propaganda platform.

Those who attended found the meeting of great interest, and it was agreed at the time that a further meeting would be called to discuss aspects of “Democracy.” This subject arose out of the discussion on Hungary and our attitude to workers who are struggling for democracy.

P. H.

“CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM”

John Strachey (Victor Gollancz Ltd).

MR. STRACHEY has never lacked a cause or a pen to wield on its behalf. He has both a talent for remembering and reproducing what others have told him and later forgetting what it was really all about. In turn he has been a currency reformer, I.L.P.'er, a Left Book Club writer of fairy tales for political innocents about “the Socialist one-sixth of the world,” an alleged Marxist, a Keynes admirer, a Labourite, and Minister in two Labour Governments. Such has been the evolution from half-baked theorist to hard-boiled politician.

That such a varied diet of ill-digested theories has

induced intellectual heartburn, explains the burping Marxism in his latest book, *Contemporary Capitalism*. Although Mr. Strachey has arrived at political respectability, he fashionably sowed his wild oats in Communist heresy, and he has skeletons in his cupboard. We find them grinning at us at times through his book, in the guise of Marxist revisionism. Like all revisionists, he comes not to revise Marxism, but to destroy it.

Mr. Strachey pays lip service to Socialism, but it has never meant for him anything else than the vague Labour notion of “the good society,” currently expressed

in the utility utopia of "The Welfare State." That Socialism is a working-class issue, embodying a different social and economic organisation with a different set of human values, is for Mr. Strachey the seventh veil of political mystery.

Actually his book on present day Capitalism is largely an echo of the past whose font was Edward Bernstein, one of the founding fathers of Reformism. His work, *Evolutionary Socialism*, is the watershed of Marxist Revisionism. Like Mr. Strachey, Bernstein "came to bury Marx, not to praise him."

Briefly, Bernstein believed that the growth of the credit system and the rise of trusts and cartels would lead to the economic regulation and control of Capitalism. Not only would cut-throat rivalry and anarchy of production disappear, but alongside this the social democrats would seek to organise the working-class politically and transform the State in the direction of "true" democracy. Thus he maintained that democratic pressure and the exercise of ethical principles would gradually transform Capitalism into a humane and civilized society. The subsequent evolution of Capitalism shattered the facile and optimistic assumptions of Bernstein. Capitalism without tears was his version of Socialism. It is also Mr. Strachey's.

Only on one issue do Mr. Strachey and Bernstein disagree. One of the main points of Bernstein's revisionism was a denial of the validity of the "Law of the Concentration and Centralization of Capital." Mr. Strachey not only accepts this "law," but argues that it has effected what he terms "a social mutation." The essence of this "mutation," we are to understand, is that in an economy of large and few units a point is reached in the increased size and decreased number which allows the managers of the remaining units to affect prices instead of being affected by them. (Page 26).

We are further told (Page 29) that "in any sphere of production where firms are large and few, they can by their power to affect prices, affect the level of their own profits." Capitalism, argues Mr. Strachey, has lost its regulator, the impersonal force of the competitive market, it has been or is being replaced by the conscious decisions of groups of men who, by tacitly refraining from competitive pricing, may move prices within limits. We are not told what the ceiling of these limits is, but one gathers from Mr. Strachey that it can be pretty high.

Mr. Strachey's conclusions seem to be then that throughout the large units of industry the margin between costs and selling price can by agreement among the various groups be so arranged as to realise a profit above the average or norm. It follows then that if the ability to affect prices so as to obtain an above the average profit, or what is known as maximum returns, characterises extant capitalist society, then maximum profit must constitute a profit norm.

But it is a Marxist axiom that the distribution of profits can of itself add nothing to the sum of values produced by the social labour force. Ruling out that the extra profit is a deduction from working-class wages, the extra profit of some concerns can only come out of the pockets of other concerns. There can be then no such thing as a prevailing law of maximum profit, for it is fairly evident that as the power to raise prices spread from point to point of the economy, what some capitalists gained on the "selling" swings they would lose on the "buying" roundabouts. The net result would tend towards an equalisation of profit, even though the price

structure of the economy would be distorted.

It is true that firms do use monopolistic advantages to seek monopolistic gain. But if that be the measure of this "mutation," then mercantilism was a greater mutation than present society. It is the nature of capitalists to seek maximum gain. Even in laissez-faire capitalism they sought maximum gain, through any device or resources which gave them superior competitive power. Because the accumulation of capital is the most compulsive feature of capitalist society at any time, capitalists will use all available means to produce and reproduce their capital. That monopolistic practices have become one of these means in their attempt to do so, is itself a normal and logical development in capitalist society.

There is a widespread belief among the uninformed, among whom Mr. Strachey must be counted, that the British Economy is in the iron grip of a relatively few powerful concerns. The belief does not tally with the facts. In the first place, big monopolies compete against each other. Also the power of these big monopolies acts as a restraint on any one of them seeking abnormal returns. And even if a monopoly does seek to obtain super-profit, it faces the danger of other giants entering the field. Even those concerns that are suppliers of particular products often meet with fierce competition from substitutes.

Again, powerful organisations of sellers bring into being powerful organisations of buyers, and strenuous price-haggling results. Not only do big buyers play one supplier off against another, but they are prepared to "roll their own" if the prices of supplies are too high.

It is true that big monopolies make big profits, but in relation to their huge capital turnover, their rate of profit may be no more, even less, than that of many smaller concerns.

Mr. Strachey, conscious perhaps of the weakness of his claims, drags his economic nets and brings in cartels to illustrate his social mutation. Indeed, they are the only attempt at evidence he offers. It is true that cartels flourished during the period between the wars, especially in certain important British industries. They were enabled to do so by the connivance of the Government of the time and by protection duties. These cartels did not exemplify Mr. Strachey's "conscious regulating power of Capitalism," but the desperate plight to which world conditions had reduced many sections of British industry.

Cartels, which Mr. Strachey makes his strong suit, are the weakest form of monopolistic organization. Their chief function is to combat price-cutting in times of bad trade. Even so, there are always temptations for some firms to sell below the cartel price. Also price-cutting takes place in cartels by the granting of long-term credit facilities, quantity discounts, free delivery, etc.

Neither does it necessarily follow that restriction of output and price manipulation by cartels allow of extra profit because restriction of output can keep low-cost firms back and preserve high-cost ones. Thus the spread-over cost will be considerable and profit margins correspondingly reduced to approximately competitive levels. In times of good trade the rules of cartels will be much less stringent and in some cases ignored.

Mr. Strachey also includes in his mutation what is termed monopolistic competition. This is an alternative to price-cutting by the use of effective selling methods, although even then price-cutting takes place in the form of adding extras and variations to the product.

Monopolistic competition confers, however, no power

on firms to affect their own profit levels. Huge staffs of salesmen, highly decorative labelling and packaging, the costly and constant advertising in press, radio and television, greatly enhance total costs and thus reduce profit margins. So far from monopolistic competition being some conscious form of regulating Capitalism, it only too clearly reveals what compulsions are attached to the realisation of surplus value and the vicious and anti-social channels they often take. To say that a variation of competition from the cut-throat to the monopolistic is a transformation of Capitalism is like saying that if knuckle fighting is replaced by boxing gloves with horse shoes in them, fisticuffs will be mutated, although the participants will still be mutilated.

That Mr. Strachey should really think that changes in the realisation of profit constitute a transformation of Capitalism is enough to make the pages of Marx's *Capital* curl up at their edges with laughter.

Capital is not, as Mr. Strachey seems to think, something which people are free to use as they choose. Capital is an historically conditioned form of wealth, expressed in the class ownership of society. And the motives and objectives of the owners of capital are prescribed for them by this form of control. That is why the basic law of Capitalism is the self-expansion of capital via the production and reproduction of surplus value. It is for that reason that the owners of capital today compete not only on a bigger scale, but with more ferocious intensity than did their 19th century counterparts. To preserve and reproduce capital to an ever greater degree has for its owners the same overriding compulsion it always had.

Mr. Strachey, like many Liberals, sees in State economic intervention stepping stones to Socialism. He

is indifferent to the fact that the expansion of Capitalism necessitates State participation. He talks glibly of the State taking over key controls, but is careful not to suggest the old Labour nostrum of nationalisation as the universal remedy. Nor does he offer any evidence to show how State possession of key controls will alter or affect the primary objectives and aims of Capitalist society.

He is dazzled, or appears to be, by the attempts of social reformers to come to terms with the class conflicts engendered by Capitalism. He believes with Bernstein that State power can be shared between the classes with an ever greater degree of power going to the exploited class. It is this which gives him and others the illusion of great democratic victories. For Mr. Strachey the State is a means of class reconciliation and collusion where in reality its intervention—via social reforms—is an attempt to soften the tension of class conflict. That the dismal failure of Social Democracy to realise its own limited social ideals provides itself the key to the real nature of Capitalist society is a lesson not yet learned by Mr. Strachey.

For someone who once claimed to be a Marxist, even though a "Moscow one," his efforts to see State activity and intervention as something socially new is laughable. In actual fact, State activity is socially old, and whatever class society one examines in the past, one will always discover the State functioning very actively and significantly to guarantee and further the interests of a particular set of property relations.

Mr. Strachey in his political adventures has certainly gone a long way but in the opposite direction to Socialism.

E. W.

(Other aspects of Mr. Strachey's book will be dealt with in a later article).

COMMUNISM AND NATIONALISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST

This interesting book by W. Z. Lequeur (published by Routledge & Kegan Paul) is worth reading, both from the point of view of an understanding of Middle-Eastern politics and the study of Soviet and Communist party politics. This study, said by the author to be the first of its kind on the Middle East, deals with the Communist and Fascist parties (and similar organisations) and their connection with the rise of Arab nationalism in the Middle East. Most of the book is devoted to the history of these movements. The bibliographical notes cover 47 pages.

The book deals, as is expected, more with the Communist and fellow-traveller-type parties, than with the Fascist parties. The obvious link between these totalitarian organisations, the similarity in structure, object and ideas is well drawn. The co-operation throughout the Middle East between the Communist and Fascist parties, and the obvious harmony that exists between them is also well shown.

The intrigues, spying, treachery, double-dealing and sudden reversals of policy, which are common not only to Communist parties in the Middle East, but all over the world, are well covered. The author quite rightly links these political ups and downs with the Soviet Union and its foreign policy. He states: "We face similar conflicting trends in the role of the Communist parties. Their task in the age of 'revolution from above' is definitely not to engage in a 'leftist deviation'; i.e.,

to try their luck in a revolution. Strategically speaking, their assignment is that of a fifth column, which is not to strike before the other four are on the march..." (Page 279).

The jettisoning of local Communist parties in favour of the existing regimes by the Soviet Union when politically expedient is an old story. (The Communist party of India being one of the most recent). But the case of the Turkish Communist Party is particularly blatant. "The leaders of the Turkish Communist Party were killed on January 28th, 1921, but more than two months passed before the news was published. On March 16th a friendship pact between the Soviet Union and Turkey was signed in Moscow. The Soviet leaders had already decided by that time (though the murder of the Turkish Communists was, of course, a heavy blow) that it was more important for them to establish friendly relations with Kemal's regime than to put all their money on such a doubtful horse as Turkish Communism." (Page 211).

Some interesting figures are given on land ownership in Egypt and Irak. In Egypt: "80 per cent. of all Egyptian farmers own no land, of those who have land, more than 80 per cent. have less than two acres, which is considered the absolute minimum." (Page 38). In Irak: "88 per cent. of the peasants own no more than 6.5 per cent. of the land, while the rest of the land is in the hands of the state and about one thousand shaikhs..." (Page 173). All of which more than bears out the proposition

that 90 per cent. of the world's population own virtually nothing, whilst a small minority own and control all that is in and on the earth, and live in parasitical manner—in luxury—off the products of the majority.

Laqueur, like so many others writing on this sort of subject, makes the mistake of taking the Communists at face value. Implicit in his last chapter, headed "Conclusions" and Appendix 1, is the idea that Communism and Socialism are different things, with which, of course, we would violently disagree, but that the state capitalism of Russia is Communism. This, of course, accounts for some of the peculiar things he has to say about Marxism: "In no Asian country was there an industrial proletariat strong enough to head a successful revolutionary movement. The only theoretical alternative, according to orthodox Marxism, was therefore to give up the struggle for a social revolution and to wait until such a revolutionary leadership would emerge." (Page 295-296). "Marxism, which was originally the theory of proletarian revolution in the most highly developed industrial countries, has thus been made in our time (in its post-

Leninist stage) the practice of revolution in the backward countries." (Page 297).

As far as the Socialist Party of Great Britain is concerned, the theory of class-conscious proletarian revolution of a world-wide scale in the highly developed areas of capitalism and the introduction of Socialism or Communism, whichever you prefer (the terms mean the same thing to us), is still a part of Marxism. Marxism to us is not just the above, but is the Materialist Conception of History, the Critique of Capitalism, the Labour theory of Value, Class-struggle, and, of course, quite logically from these flows the Socialist revolution. The idea of Socialism being established in one country, or backward countries, apart from being in complete opposition to this proposition, has been adequately dealt with in our literature, particularly in the pamphlets on Russia. It seems a pity that a reasonably good book should be spoilt by such inane conclusions, but then we can't put a Socialist head on pro-capitalist shoulders.

JON. KEYS.

ROAD ACCIDENTS—WHY?

IN recent years a great deal of attention has been focused on the problem of the ever-increasing casualty rate built up by the large number of fatal road accidents.

This problem is international in character, and is found in every country where modern transport methods are being used. As the fatal accidents go on increasing the social nature of the problem becomes evident, and governments are taking over the management of roads from local authorities and other voluntary bodies in an effort to devise ways and means of alleviating the worst effects, but without success. In common with other social problems, such as war, crime, health and poverty, very little progress is made towards a solution. In an endeavour to force people to follow a certain pattern of behaviour, new regulations are made and very severe penalties imposed on drivers. Road Safety campaigns are launched, and the clergy are prepared to denounce bad road users as sinners, but in spite of the application of these devices, almost to the point of persecution, the problem persists undiminished. The cause is quite evident, and is in fact recognised by various experts advising governments. For instance, Lord Derwent, chairman of the British Road Federation, at a conference in London on 17th September this year, made the following remarks: "There is not a nation in the world today that is so prosperous, so rich in resources, or so lacking in design and engineering skill that it can tolerate for further decades the utter waste of time, precious fuel and general wear and tear that happens every day in the traffic jams that are a blight on practically all major cities." He also went on to state that "Seventy-five per cent. of Britain's road accidents happened in built-up areas, where there were too many vehicles, too many pedestrians, and too many cyclists." Similar opinions have been expressed from time to time by road engineers, safety experts, social investigators and motor and transport organisations, who have carried out a great deal of research in an effort to find a solution.

Most of the factors that lead to congestion on the roads are the result of capitalist development, and indeed are necessary to the furtherance of a capitalist economy

—the transference of freight traffic from the railways to road transport services at lower cost and with greater efficiency (this also applies to passenger traffic), the need for mobility of labour, requiring quick easy travel at low cost, and the creation of large housing estates far removed from sources of employment. There is also a very large increase in the number of vehicles used by commercial firms providing low cost and efficient transport for directors, travellers and salesmen. The same facilities are required for people engaged in professional work, and those employed by local authorities. Add to this the many thousands of pleasure motorists and tourists to complete the picture of chaos on the roads.

The origin of many social problems is contained within capitalist society in embryo, and grow more or less at the same pace as its development. Since it is essential for capital to be invested in profitable projects, it is inevitable that the social problems must continue. The alternative is to change the basis of society from a capitalist economy to one based on common ownership, Socialism.

J. CUTHBERTSON.

DORKING AND HORSHAM

Members and sympathisers in the Dorking and Horsham districts who are interested in groups that are being formed, are asked to get in touch with the Central Branch Secretary at Head Office, 52, Clapham High Street, London, S.W.4.

PUBLIC DEBATE

"Which Party should the Working Class Support—the Socialist Party of Great Britain or the Militant Socialist Group?"

For the S.P.G.B. - - - - W. READ

For the M.S.G. - - - - J. BRITZ

Chairman - - A. W. IVIMEY

Bethnal Green Library (Bethnal Green Central Line)
Friday, December 14th at 7.30 p.m.

DOCUMENTARY FILMS at HEAD OFFICE

Documentary Films followed by brief Socialist comments at H.Q.

52, CLAPHAM HIGH STREET, S.W.4.

(near Clapham North Tube Station)

Every Sunday evening at 7.30 p.m.

The meeting is then open for questions and discussion which can be continued in the Social Room afterwards when light refreshments will be on sale. Visitors particularly welcome.

Dec. 2nd "Balzac"—E. KERSLEY.

„ 9th Extract: NEW BABYLON


"The Storming of the Barricades
of the Paris Commune—GILMAC

„ 16th "Drama of Christ"—H. JARVIS

PAMPHLETS

Questions of the Day	1/- (Post free 1/2)
The Socialist Party and War	1/- „ „ 1/2
Russia Since 1917	1/- „ „ 1/2
The Communist Manifesto and the Last Hundred Years	1/- „ „ 1/2
The Racial Problem— A Socialist Analysis	1/- „ „ 1/2
Socialism	4d. „ „ 6d.
Socialism or Federal Union	4d. „ „ 6d.
The Socialist Party: Its Principles and Policy	4d. „ „ 6d.
Is Labour Government the Way to Socialism?	4d. „ „ 6d.
Nationalisation or Socialism?	6d. „ „ 8d.

All obtainable from the Literature Committee,
52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4.



OUTDOOR PROPAGANDA

SUNDAYS

Hyde Park ...	11.15 a.m.—2 p.m.
	3.30—6 p.m.
East Street (Walworth) ...	Dec. 2nd 11 a.m.
	„ 9th 12.30 p.m.
	„ 16th 11 a.m.
	„ 22nd 12.30 p.m.
	„ 30th 11 a.m.
Whitestone Pond (Hampstead) ...	11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park ...	11.30 a.m.

LUNCH HOUR MEETINGS

Tower Hill ... Thursdays at 1 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN

OBJECT The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Great Britain holds:—

- 1 That Society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.
 - 2 That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
 - 3 That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
 - 4 That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind without distinction of race or sex.
 - 5 That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.
 - 6 That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.
 - 7 That as all political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
 - 8 THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.
- Those agreeing with the above principles and desire enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

Copies of the SOCIALIST STANDARD are on sale at the newspaper stands as named below. Members and sympathisers are asked to buy from these stands when possible:—

"THE BLACKSTOCK": Finsbury Park. (Sunday morning).

"PRINCES HEAD": Battersea Park Road. (Daily—mornings).

GREAT PORTLAND ST. Tube Station: (Sunday morning).

"RED LION": Kingsbury Rd., Hendon. Sunday morning).

RUSSELL Sq. Tube Station: (Daily).

SHEPHERDS BUSH Tube Station: (Daily—morning).

WIMBLEDON Stn.: (Daily—morning).

WEALDSTONE Station (Sunday morning).

KENTON Station (Sunday morning).

HAMMERSMITH—King Street. (SMITH'S (not W. H.) Newsagents.

HOLLOWAY: Paper shop, D. Johnston, Brecknoch Road.

FINSBURY PARK STATION: Main paper stall.

NAG'S HEAD, HOLLOWAY: Main paper stall.

HIGHBURY CORNER: Main paper stall—station.

COLLIERS WOOD: Underground Station (Daily—morning)

DISCUSSION AND STUDY GROUPS

(Non-members cordially invited to meetings. Inquiries should be addressed to Secretary at the addresses given below.)
BRISTOL—Secretary: J. Flowers, 6, Backfields (off Upper York Street), Bristol.
 2. Meets every 3rd Tuesday.
DUNDEE GROUP—For information write to W. Elphinstone, 10, Bennie Road, Dundee.
EDINBURGH. Enquiries to A. Hollingshead, 39, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh.
OLDHAM—Group meets Wednesdays, 7.30, at address of R. Lees, 35, Manchester St. Phone MA1 5165.

EALING BRANCH XMAS SOCIAL

Saturday, December 15th
 at "The Ealing Park Tavern"

South Ealing Road.

(Near South Ealing Underground Station)

7.30 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. Admission 2s. 6d.

Free Refreshments. Licensed Bar.

ARE YOU A MEMBER?

Socialism is worth all the effort that can be put in to achieve it. Progress towards Socialism depends largely upon the number of Socialists organised together to obtain it. The larger the number the more propaganda can be done and the quicker we will get there.
 On the inside of the back page of this issue you will find set out our object and Declaration of Principles. If you agree with them your place is in our ranks.

TWO PAMPHLETS ON RUSSIA

"THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—It's Origin and Outcome,"

(Published by the Socialist Party of Canada, obtainable from S.P.G.B. 50 pages, 6d., post free 8d.)

"RUSSIA SINCE 1917," (114 pages, 1/-, post free 1/3).

SOCIALIST STANDARD SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Detach and forward, with remittance, to
 Literature Secretary, S.P.G.B., 52, Clapham High
 Street, London, S.W.4.

Please send SOCIALIST STANDARD for 12 months
 (6 months, 3/-) for which 6/- is enclosed.

Name
 (BLOCK LETTERS)

Address

(State, if renewal, or new subscriber)

BRANCH MEETINGS

All meetings are open to the public and visitors are welcomed.

BIRMINGHAM meets Thursdays, 8.0 p.m., at "Big Bull's Head," Digbeth. Discussions 2nd and 4th Thursdays in month. Correspondence to Secretary, Flat 1, 23 Cambridge Road, Birmingham, 14.

BLOOMSBURY. Meets 1st and 3rd Thursdays in month at Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, W.C.1., at 7.30 p.m. Dec. 6th and 20th.

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT. The branch Secretary will be very pleased to answer all enquiries. Write, J. T. Sheals, 36, Reevy Crescent, Buttershaw, Bradford, or ring Bradford 71904 at any time.

CAMBERWELL meets Thursdays at 8 p.m., "The Artichoke," Camberwell Church Street. Correspondence to Sec. H. Baldwin, 32, Solon Road, Brixton, S.W.2.

DARTFORD meets every Friday at 8 p.m., Dartford Labour Club, Lowfield St., Dartford. Discussions after branch business. Sec.: G. Gundry, 20, Love Lane, Bexley, Kent.

EALING meets every Friday at 8 p.m. sharp, at The Memorial Hall, Windsor Road, Ealing (nr. Ealing Broadway). Correspondence to E. T. Critchfield, 48, Balfour Road, W.13.

ECCLES meets 2nd Friday in month, at 7.30 p.m., at 5, Gaskell Road, Eccles Secretary, F. Lea.

FULHAM AND CHELSEA. Meet every Thursday, at 8 p.m., All enquiries to J. Keys, 6, Keppel House, Lucon Place, Chelsea, S.W.3, where branch meets.

GLASGOW (City) Communications to Sec. R. Reid, 35, Eldon Street, Glasgow, C.3. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays (Dec. 12th and 26th) at 8 p.m., The Religious Institute Rooms, 200 Buchanan Street, Glasgow, C.1.

GLASGOW (Kelvingrove) meets alternate Mondays, Dec. 3rd, 17th and 31st at 8 p.m. at 76, Dunbarton Road, Partick. Communications to R. Russell, Secretary, 471, St. Vincent, Glasgow, C.3.

HACKNEY meets Mondays at 8 p.m., at 12, Mare Street, Hackney (Cambridge Heath end). Sec.: A. Ivimey, 99, Somerford Estate, Stoke Newington, N.16.

HAMPSTEAD Enquiries to G. Stead, 38, Lichfield Road, N.W.2. Branch meets alternate Wednesdays at 8 p.m. (Dec. 5th and 19th) at Vienna Restaurant, 289, Finchley Road, Hampstead, N.W.3.

ISLINGTON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, 129, Seven Sisters Road, N.7. Lecture or discussion after Branch business. J. Doherty, 11, Oakfield Road, N.4.

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES Sec., 19, Spencer Road, East Molesey (Tel. MOL 6492). Branch meets Thursday at 8 p.m. at above address.

LEWISHAM meets Mondays, 8 p.m., Co-op Hall, (Room 1) Davenport Road, Rushey Green, Catford, S.E.6. Sec. M. Judd, 320, Brownhill Road, S.E.6.

MANCHESTER Branch meets fortnightly Tuesdays, Dec. 4th, and 18th George & Dragon Hotel, Bridge St.; Sec.: J. M. Breakey, 2, Dennison Avenue, Manchester 20. Phone: D1Dsbury 5709.

NOTTINGHAM meets 1st Wednesday in each month at the Peoples Hall, Heathcoat St., Nottingham, at 7.45 p.m. Sec. J. Clark, 82a Wellington Road, Burton-on-Trent.

PADDINGTON meets Wednesdays, 8.0 p.m. The Laurie Arms, Crawford Place, (Off Edgware Road, adjacent to Marylebone Road), W.1. Discussion after Branch business. Sec. C. May, 1, Hanover Road, N.W.10.

S.W. LONDON meets Thursdays, 8 p.m.; 52, Clapham High Street, S.W.4. Correspondence: Secretary, c/o. Head Office.

SOUTHEND meets every Tuesday at 8 p.m., at Co-op Hall, Southchurch Road, Southend (entrance Essex St.). Visitors welcome. Enquiries to J. G. Grisley, 17, Cotswold Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, Essex.

SWANSEA Communications to D. Long, 54, Castle Street, Loughor, Swansea, Glamorgan.

TOTTENHAM meets 2nd and 4th Wednesdays in month, 8.10 p.m., West Green Library, Vincent Road, West Green Road, N.15. Communications to Secretary, S. Hills 1, Devonshire Road, Tottenham, N.17.

WEST HAM meets every Thursday at 8 p.m. at Salisbury Road Schools, Manor Park, E.12. Discussions after each meeting from 9 p.m. Communications to F. J. Mann, 18 Larchwood Ave., Romford, Essex. Romford 5171.

WICKFORD meets every Thursday at 7.30 p.m., "Skara Brae," Farm Crescent, Woodham Road, Battlesbridge, Essex. Enquiries to Secretary, L. R. Plummer.

WOOD GREEN AND HORNSEY Branch meets Thursdays, 7.30 p.m., Stirling House, Stuart Crescent, Wood Green, N.22. Letters to Sec., 18, Victoria Road, Edmonton, N.18.

WOOLWICH meets 2nd and 4th Friday of month, 7 p.m. Town Social Club, Mason's Hill, S.E.18. Discussion after branch business (8 p.m.). Sec. H. C. Rammy, 9, Milne Gardens, Eltham, S.E.9.

"WHAT CAN I DO?"

- * Canvass the S.S.
- * Get subscriptions for the S.S.
- * Submit names for sample copies.
- * Get news-agents to sell the S.S.
- * Get libraries to display the S.S.
- * Sell the S.S. at Meetings and to friends.
- * Deliver the S.S. to regular Subscribers in your area